

MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES

EDITED BY

JAMES WILSON BRIGHT, Editor-in-Chief

GUSTAV GRUENBAUM

WILLIAM KURRELMAYER

H. CARRINGTON LANCASTER

CONTENTS

HAVENS, GEORGE R.—The Theory of "Natural Goodness" in Rousseau's 'Nouvelle Héloïse,'	385
HEUSER, FREDERICK W. J.—Personal and Literary Relations of Hauptmann and Wedekind,	395
WILLIAMS, STANLEY T.—The Dramas of Richard Cumberland,	403
CAMPBELL, OSCAR J.—Wordsworth Bandies Jests with Matthew,	408
HIMES, JOHN A.—Further Interpretations of Milton,	414
EDDY, WILLIAM A.—A Source for 'Gulliver's Travels,'	419

Reviews:—

ALBERT SCHINZ, French Literature of the Great War. [André Morize.]	422
T. B. RUDMOSE-BROWN, <i>La Galerie du Palais</i> , comédie par Pierre Corneille, edited. [H. Carrington Lancaster.]	427
EMIL ERMATINGER, Gottfried Kellers Leben;	
EMIL ERMATINGER, Gottfried Kellers Briefe und Tagebücher;	
MAX KALBECK, Paul Heyse und Gottfried Keller im Briefwechsel. [Edward F. Hauch.]	430
Johnson Club Papers by Various Hands. [James H. Pitman.]	436

Correspondence:—

HENNING, GEO. N., Toutes Choses,	438
TROMBLEY, ALBERT E., A Note on Biré's <i>Victor Hugo après 1830</i> ,	439
VAN ROOSBROECK, G. L., The Birthdate of Puget de la Serre,	440
WOODBIDGE, BENJ. M., Pathelin, Line 344,	441
BEATTY, JOSEPH M., JR., Notes on the Authorship of <i>The North Briton</i> ,	442

Brief Mention:—

RICHARD F. JONES, The Background of the 'Battle of the Books';	
HERMANN FISCHER, Schwäbisches Wörterbuch; JEAN VIC, Charles Du-	
fresny, <i>Amusemens sérieux et comiques</i> ; J. GÓMEZ OCEÁN y R. M. TEN-	
REIRO, Comedias de Lope de Vega,	443

THE JOHNS HOPKINS PRESS
BALTIMORE

Eight Numbers a Year—Single Copy (Current) Sixty-five Cents

Entered as Second-Class Matter at the Baltimore, Maryland, Postoffice

Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in Section 1103,
Act of October 3, 1917. Authorized on July 3, 1918

MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES

A MONTHLY PUBLICATION with inter-
mission from July to October (inclusive)

This publication is devoted to linguistic and literary research and to aesthetic and philosophic criticism in the domain of English, German, and the related Germanic Languages; and of French, Italian, Spanish, and the other Languages of the Romance Group. Its purpose is also to promote sound methods in the teaching of the Modern Languages and Literatures

The Subscription Price of the current annual volume is
\$5.00 for the United States and Mexico; Canada \$5.25
and \$5.50 for other countries included in the Postal Union.

Contributors and Publishers will please address matter for the English Department of the *Notes* to James W. Bright; for the German Department to William Kurrelmeyer; for the French Department to H. Carrington Lancaster; for the Italian and Spanish Departments to Gustav Gruenbaum. Other matter may be sent to the Editor-in-Chief. The address of all the editors is Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md.

Subscriptions and other business communications should be sent to the Johns Hopkins Press, Baltimore, Md.

PREPARATION OF COPY

All copy should be in typewritten form.

Underscore (for italics) all titles of books, periodicals, poems, plays and other separately published compositions.

Use numerals in designating foot-notes, and number foot-notes in unbroken sequence.

Use roman numerals for volume-reference, set off by a comma before a following page-reference.

A NEW VOLUME IN THE OXFORD FRENCH SERIES
BY AMERICAN SCHOLARS

DUMAS' LE DEMI-MONDE

Comédie en Cinq Actes en Prose

Edited with an Introduction and Notes

By HUGH ALLISON SMITH AND ROBERT BELL MICHELL

Romance Languages, University of Wisconsin

The *Demi-Monde* is probably the most important and significant of the plays of Dumas fils. With the *Demi-Monde* he inaugurated Social Drama; a realistic study of the social problems of his day as he saw them manifested in the society of Paris with which he was acquainted.

In dialogue and style we also find Dumas at his best in this play. He had not yet become too much the moralist and preacher. The conversation is witty and entertaining and the speeches rarely, if ever, long to the point of suggesting the lecture. The present is the only edition authorized by Calman-Levy.

*Copies of the above for examination with a
view to class use may be had on request.*



OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS
American Branch
35 WEST 32ND STREET, NEW YORK



MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES

VOLUME XXXVI

NOVEMBER, 1921

NUMBER 7

THE THEORY OF "NATURAL GOODNESS" IN ROUSSEAU'S *NOUVELLE HELOÏSE*

The present article proposes to study in detail the theories expressed in the *Nouvelle Héloïse* regarding what is commonly called the "natural goodness of man." It is evident that no subject can have greater importance for an accurate understanding of Rousseau's novel. Mr. Schinz has already pointed out that Rousseau's views on the question of natural goodness did not remain fixed and free from variation in works anterior to the *Nouvelle Héloïse*; namely, the First and Second Discourses.¹ It is therefore dangerous to speak of the theories of Jean-Jacques *en bloc*. Each work is deserving of separate and detailed study from the point of view of this theory and generalizations must be made with great caution.

Can we safely follow Mr. Schinz in grouping together the *Nouvelle Héloïse* and *Emile* in the statement that both picture man as "bon au fond"?² Shall we, with Beaudoin, speak of all Rousseau's work in one breath and say: "Dans son système, suivre sa nature est toute la morale"?³ Ought we to agree fully with M. Cuendet that Rousseau's conception of nature "est dans tous les cas aux antipodes de la conception augustinienne de la corruption radicale de l'homme séparé de Dieu et privé de la grâce"?⁴ Was Masson right in accusing Rousseau of forgetting "la faiblesse

¹ Albert Schinz, "La notion de vertu dans le Premier Discours de J. J. Rousseau," *Mercur de France*, 1er juin 1912. "La théorie de la bonté naturelle de l'homme chez Rousseau," *Revue du XVIIIe siècle*, 1913.

² *Rev. du XVIIIe siècle* (1913), p. 445.

³ H. Beaudoin, *La vie et les œuvres de J. J. Rousseau* (1891), II, p. 513.

⁴ W. Cuendet, *La philosophie religieuse de J. J. Rousseau* (1913), p. 162.

humaine" and is his a Christianity "d'où le sentiment du péché a disparu"?⁵ To what extent did Rousseau in the *Nouvelle Héloïse* deny the reality of "the civil war in the cave,"⁶ the struggle between good and evil in the breast of the individual? How far did Jean-Jacques believe in the doctrine of "innate goodness"?⁷ so often associated with his name?

An answer to these questions, so far as the *Nouvelle Héloïse* is concerned, can safely be given only after a study of all the passages which mention or imply the existence or the non-existence of "la bonté naturelle." Among these, as will appear, there are contradictions to be taken into account, contradictions doubtless in part explained by the necessity, in a philosophical novel, of permitting the clash of conflicting points of view. Moreover, no study of this subject would be accurate or complete if it were limited to weighing the evidence of individual passages, important and necessary as that is; we must also consider the trend of the work as a whole.

We soon find that the term, "natural goodness," needs definition and that Rousseau himself does not always offer us the same conception of it. The word "nature," then as now, is used sometimes with one meaning, sometimes with another. In a majority of cases, however, the word is employed to designate a state, a character, or impulses, which are primitive, instinctive, or non-artificial.⁸ Thus,

⁵ Pierre Maurice Masson, *La religion de J. J. Rousseau* (1916), II, p. 294.

⁶ Irving Babbitt, *Rousseau and Romanticism* (1919), p. 187. Cf. pp. 122, 130, 157, 256, 330. Cf. Diderot, *Œuvres* (Assézat), II, p. 246.

⁷ Paul Elmer More, *Shelburne Essays*, VI, pp. 215, 223.

⁸ After analysing the use of the word "nature" in the *Nouvelle Héloïse*, I have reached the following conclusions. *Nature* is used fifty-five times to designate the original creative force in the universe; one hundred five times to mean that which is due only to this original creative force, hence a primitive, instinctive, or non-artificial state, character, or impulses; ten times to indicate the existing scheme of things; twelve times applied to the physical universe; twelve times meaning the physical human or animal body or life; once in the sense of sort or kind; and three times to indicate accord with truth or probability. Of course, in such classifications, the dividing line is not always easy to draw and it is not claimed that these figures are to be taken as more than approximately true. Different individuals, even the same individual at different times, would undoubtedly make a somewhat different classification. Hence, we feel justified in concluding only that Jean-Jacques puts the emphasis overwhelmingly upon primitivism in the passages where he uses the words *nature* or *naturel* or *naturellement*.

it is clear that in the passages where Rousseau specifically uses the word "nature" he is most often stressing his belief in *primitivism*, but when the question of man's goodness or virtue is raised, we soon find Rousseau offering us several different points of view.

There is, for example, the belief expressed by Wolmar that man is neither good nor bad, but neutral. "Je conçus que le caractère général de l'homme est un amour propre indifférent par lui-même, bon ou mauvais par les accidents qui le modifient."⁹ This theory might be criticized as implying that man is really selfish, hence ready to commit a bad action at the invitation of circumstances, and therefore already bad in principle. But I have not found this idea expressed elsewhere in the *Nouvelle Héloïse* and we need not dwell upon it here.

Much more important, as we should expect from our previous discussion, is the place given to what we may call *primitive goodness*. Man was good "before the Fall," said the Church, "before being spoiled by society," said Rousseau as he looked back regretfully, like many another since, to "the good old days." Saint-Preux writes: "Tout consiste à ne pas gâter l'homme de la nature en l'appropriant à la société."¹⁰ Julie comments upon her children: "Nourris encore dans leur première simplicité, d'où leur viendroient des vices dont ils n'ont point vu d'exemple?"¹¹ Saint-Preux, using a commonplace of voyage literature, speaks of "les peuples bons et simples"¹² and Julie says: "L'on devient comme un nouvel être sorti récemment des mains de la nature."¹³ Saint-Preux feels himself "confus, humilié, consterné, de sentir dégrader en moi la nature de l'homme."¹⁴ "Tous les caractères sont bons et sains en eux-mêmes, selon M. de Wolmar. Il n'y a point, dit-il, d'erreurs dans la nature; tous les vices qu'on impute au naturel sont l'effet des mauvaises formes qu'il a reçues."¹⁵ Other similar passages might be quoted.¹⁶

Closely allied to this theory of *primitive goodness* is the idea of *instinctive* or *innate goodness*, which has offered to opponents of

⁹ J. J. Rousseau, *Œuvres complètes* (Hachette, 1863), III, 459.

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, 545.

¹¹ *Ibid.*, 525.

¹² *Ibid.*, 492.

¹³ *Ibid.*, 368.

¹⁴ *Ibid.*, 291.

¹⁵ *Ibid.*, 510.

¹⁶ Cf. *ibid.*, pp. 131, 375 (man is here admitted to have a tendency toward evil), 455, 512, 525. Contrast p. 513.

Rousseau abundant opportunity to hold him up to easy ridicule. It is really *primitive goodness* looked at from a slightly different angle, for, if men are good by instinct, then primitive men are more likely to be true to their instincts, and hence good. Julie writes to Saint-Preux: "Tu reçus du ciel cet heureux penchant à tout ce qui est bon et honnête: n'écoute que tes propres désirs; ne suis que tes inclinations naturelles."¹⁷ Later she herself thanks Heaven "de lui avoir donné un cœur sensible et porté au bien."¹⁸ Saint-Preux writes of her to Edouard: "Pour Julie, qui n'eut jamais d'autre règle que son cœur,¹⁹ et n'en sauroit avoir de plus sûre, elle s'y livre sans scrupule, et, pour bien faire, elle fait tout ce qu'il lui demande."²⁰

But more frequently the *Nouvelle Héloïse* offers still another conception of life; namely, that of a combat against one's desires and inclinations. "La foiblesse est de l'homme," says Julie, but, "suivant une règle plus sûre que ses penchans, il sait faire le bien qui lui coûte, et sacrifier les désirs de son cœur à la loi du devoir."²¹ Claire writes to Julie: "Toute ta vie n'a été qu'un combat continu, où, même après ta défaite, l'honneur, le devoir, n'ont cessé de résister, et ont fini par vaincre."²² If it be objected that here "honor" and "duty" are but man's "natural goodness" gaining the victory, we are merely brought to a conception of goodness as a result of man's higher nature triumphing over the lower. This constitutes a third interpretation of "la bonté naturelle," perfectly legitimate here, but certainly very different from that usually given. Note too that Julie writes to Saint-Preux: "Voilà, cher Saint-Preux, la véritable humilité du chrétien; c'est de trouver toujours

¹⁷ *Ibid.*, 269.

¹⁸ *Ibid.*, 624.

¹⁹ When Rousseau here uses the word *cœur*, does he mean *instinct*, *intuition*, or *emotional feeling*, all three being in contrast to *raison*, or does he perhaps mean *conscience*? If the latter, then of course, this passage means something quite different from merely following the path of least resistance. The query helps to illustrate the difficulty of treating this subject of "la bonté naturelle" and warns one of the danger of basing an argument wholly, or even chiefly, upon Rousseau's use of special words or upon what seems to be his meaning in particular passages quoted.

²⁰ *Ibid.*, 486. Cf. pp. 142, 175, 260, 347 (this view is later renounced), 488, 153, 252 (this instinctive goodness is later lost), 253, 268, 271, 293, 521, 577.

²¹ *Ibid.*, 367.

²² *Ibid.*, 467.

sa tâche au-dessus de ses forces." ²³ Saint-Preux himself writes to Julie: "Chère amie, ne savez-vous pas que la vertu est un état de guerre et que pour y vivre on a toujours quelque combat à rendre contre soi?" ²⁴ Certainly this would seem to accord with Mr. Schinz's statement regarding the First Discourse that virtue is considered as "une lutte contre les penchans naturels de l'homme," thus implying that "l'homme est naturellement mauvais." ²⁵ If it be maintained that man, primitively good, is now struggling against himself to get back to his former state of goodness, what have we but the Biblical doctrine of the Fall, expressed in other words? Certainly, to all intents and purposes, man, whether spoiled by society or not, whether fallen from his state of original goodness or not, now appears in the words of the *Nouvelle Héloïse* as evil and forced to struggle "contre soi" in this present age. Surely Rousseau has not here lost sight of "la faiblesse humaine," as Masson has stated he sometimes did. We note these words of Saint-Preux to Julie: "S'ensuit-il de là que la prière soit inutile? A Dieu ne plaise que je m'ôte cette ressource contre mes foiblesses!" ²⁶ Julie is orthodox enough when she says: "Nous sommes libres, il est vrai, mais nous sommes ignorans, foibles, portés au mal. Et d'où nous viendroient la lumière et la force, si ce n'est de celui qui en est la source?" ²⁷ Thus she refers directly to divine aid as necessary to supplement human weakness. "J'osai compter sur moi-même," says Julie, "et voilà comment on se perd." ²⁸ In another passage she observes: "Le premier pas pour sortir de notre misère est de la connoître. Soyons humbles pour être sages; voyons notre foiblesse, et nous serons forts." ²⁹ Saint-Preux quotes Julie on the Protestant religion, which not only follows nature but corrects it, "qui la suit et la rectifie." ³⁰ Moreover, Julie came to modify her first views on the education of her children. "J'avois d'abord résolu de lui accorder tout ce qu'il demanderoit, persuadée que les premiers mouvemens de la nature sont toujours bons et salutaires. Mais je n'ai pas tardé de connoître qu'en se faisant un droit d'être obéis, les enfans sortoient de l'état de nature presque

²³ *Ibid.*, 585.

²⁴ *Ibid.*, 595.

²⁵ *Rev. du XVIIIe siècle* (1913), p. 445.

²⁶ Rousseau, *Œuvres*, III, 596.

²⁷ *Ibid.*, 587.

²⁸ *Ibid.*, 625.

²⁹ *Ibid.*, 588.

³⁰ *Ibid.*, 434.

en naissant, et contractoient nos vices par notre exemple, les leurs par notre indiscretion."³¹ This saves the face of the theorizer, but "tout juste." It is really an absolute denial of any practical value in the goodness of nature principle, primitive or otherwise. Who does not here see the practical Rousseau replacing, at least for a moment, the theoretical? In support of the combat theory of virtue there are, strange as that may seem in the light of traditional views regarding Jean-Jacques, many more passages than there are in favor of other theories of life and conduct.³²

³¹ *Ibid.*, 516.

³² Note also the following: "Il n'y a que l'art de les réprimer [les passions] qui nous manque" (p. 143); "l'honneur de combattre" (p. 144); "j'ai si peu de combats à rendre contre moi-même, tant je vous trouve attentive à les prévenir" (p. 145); "la dure espèce de combat que nous aurons désormais à soutenir" (p. 173); "témoins de ses combats et de sa victoire" (p. 179); "tu as plus combattu" (p. 181); "ce noble enthousiasme . . . qui t'éleva toujours au-dessus de toi-même" (p. 181); "tel est, mon ami, l'effet assuré des sacrifices qu'on fait à la vertu: s'ils coûtent souvent à faire, il est toujours doux de les avoir faits" (p. 198); love, "qui sait épurer nos penchans naturels" (p. 209); "ma foiblesse" (p. 209); "ne serez-vous vertueux que quand il n'en coûtera rien de l'être?" (p. 221); mention of "la fermeté stoïque" and of "Epictète" (p. 239); "il est fait pour combattre et vaincre" (p. 246); "veux-je être vertueuse" is contrasted with "veux-je suivre le penchant de mon cœur," but nature is here thought of as on the side of duty (p. 252); "je vois ainsi défigurer ce divin modèle que je porte au-dedans de moi, et qui servoit à la fois d'objet à mes désirs et de règle à mes actions" (p. 291); "les premiers actes de vertu sont toujours les plus pénibles" (p. 330); "Julie m'a trop appris comment il faut immoler le bonheur au devoir" (p. 331); "insensée et farouche vertu! j'obéis à ta voix sans mérite; je t'abhorre en faisant tout pour toi" (p. 332); "en te livrant à la fois à tous les penchans, tu les confonds au lieu de les accorder, et deviens coupable à force de vertus" (p. 348); "celui qui, par respect pour le mariage, résisteroit au penchant de son cœur" (p. 349); "les désirs mêmes ne sembloient naitre que pour nous donner l'honneur de les vaincre" (p. 359); "la force dont j'avois besoin pour résister à mon propre cœur" (p. 363); "malgré que j'en aie, il m'élève au-dessus de moi-même, et je sens qu'à force de confiance il m'apprend à la mériter" (pp. 415-16); Julie believes in discipline, not indulgence, for children (p. 421); "elle soutint ce jour-là le plus grand combat qu'âme humaine ait pu soutenir; elle vainquit pourtant" (p. 481); "on n'a besoin que de soi pour réprimer ses penchans, on a quelquefois besoin d'autrui pour discerner ceux qu'il est permis de suivre," thus pointing out the necessity of a check upon many of our inclinations (p. 483); "le spectacle d'une âme sublime et pure, triomphant

If it seems that these passages are not in themselves conclusive, consider the book as a whole. The first parts of the *Nouvelle Héloïse* are the story of the downfall of Saint-Preux and of Julie through following their natural instincts without check. Then comes Julie's conversion, and what started as though it were to be a glorification of the primal rights of passion and of "natural" instincts, continues as the narrative of Julie's struggle toward a virtue to be won, not through her own strength or "natural goodness" alone, but through divine aid. It is true that at the end we find her love for Saint-Preux still burning, but in spite of this she is able to rejoice that death will soon remove from her the possibility of yielding to this love, a fact which seems to show that she too at the end finds herself very human in her weakness and unable to work out alone her own salvation. Her very acquiescence, however, in this outcome shows that duty has triumphed over her natural instincts. Is not the outcome optimistic rather than pessimistic?³³ Was not her real mistake in thinking that the *ménage à trois* could be successful? Whether Rousseau consciously intended it or not, such seems to be the conclusion of his book. Let us note

de ses passions et régner sur elle-même" (p. 482); "je doute qu'on puisse jamais tirer un bon parti d'un mauvais caractère, et que tout naturel puisse être tourné à bien" (p. 513); "aurions-nous jamais fait ce progrès par nos seules forces? Jamais, jamais, mon ami; le tenter même étoit une témérité" (p. 582); "ne goûtons-nous pas mille fois le jour le prix des combats qu'elle [la vertu] nous a coûtés?" (p. 582); "l'homme est plus libre d'éviter les tentations que de les vaincre" (p. 583); "si la vie est courte pour le plaisir, qu'elle est longue pour la vertu!" (p. 584); "un homme qui sut combattre et souffrir pour elle [la vertu] (p. 585); "toute la résistance qu'on peut tirer de soi je crois l'avoir faite, et toutefois j'ai succombé" (p. 602); These passages emphasize clearly the necessity of effort and struggle to realize the possibilities of one's higher nature. They are numerous enough to show that Rousseau by no means escaped so completely from tradition and from his Calvinistic ancestry as some have led us to believe. Whether they were written by Rousseau consciously or unconsciously, the important thing is that they are there and must not be passed over.

³³ Did Rousseau bring about Julie's death at the end of the novel because he was afraid she would yield to her love for Saint-Preux, because he wished the novel to close with a scene likely to affect "les âmes sensibles," or because he felt the impossibility of continuing successfully the *ménage à trois*?

too with Lemaître³⁴ that marriage, though an institution approved by society, is greatly instrumental in Julie's redemption and that in consequence we must conclude that nature and society are not always and completely at war. If it be urged that Rousseau, who is here writing a novel, merely yields to the necessities of the *genre* in depicting a struggle, that he is unconsciously influenced by his voracious reading of novelistic literature and by his familiarity with French classic drama, or that his Genevan and Protestant heritage is here to the fore, I do not doubt that all these factors played their part in thus causing him to emphasize the idea of a struggle for virtue. Explanation may account for the fact, it does not dispose of it.

Furthermore, though Saint-Preux is generally taken as more completely Rousseau's mouthpiece than Julie and though it is true that Saint-Preux less commonly expresses doubt in human self-sufficiency, yet we note that he is generally guided and overruled by her in thought and action and is portrayed as looking up to her with respect and deference.³⁵ His virtue is almost wholly dependent upon hers. Julie herself has a chance to yield to her love for Saint-Preux, marry him, and live on Edouard's estate in England, but, in favor of her duty to her family, she refuses to follow her own inclinations.³⁶ Saint-Preux will not permit Edouard to follow "nature" to the extent of marriage with Laure,³⁷ and thus quite evidently defers to the conventions of society. Julie advocates humility rather than self-confidence,³⁸ although belief that man's inclinations were naturally good would produce exactly the opposite attitude.

Thus, in addition to the unemphasized neutral attitude of Wolmar, we have found expressed in the *Nouvelle Héloïse* three other conceptions of human life in relation to good and evil. These are the theory of *primitive goodness*; the theory, so closely allied with primitivism, of *instinctive goodness*; and the theory of *goodness as harmony with man's higher nature*. The first and the last have this in common; namely, that both admit that man in this present age must struggle against evil tendencies in order to become virtuous. Even the second, conceived as following the *inner light*

³⁴ Lemaître, *J. J. Rousseau* (Eng. trans., N. Y., 1907), pp. 199-200.

³⁵ Rousseau, *Œuvres*, III, 418.

³⁶ *Ibid.*, 257-58.

³⁷ *Ibid.*, 553.

³⁸ *Ibid.*, 585.

possessed by every one, does not necessarily exclude the idea of difficulty and struggle in carrying out the dictates of one's conscience, though this is hardly the normal, natural interpretation that we should expect it to have. It is not the interpretation given to it by those who most closely followed so-called Rousseauistic doctrine.

We have shown that in the *Nouvelle Héloïse* Rousseau broke much less with tradition than has been thought. He is more conservative than radical, clinging instinctively to much of his Calvinistic heritage, conscious that his own life was filled with bitter struggle, influenced also probably by the technique of the novel and the drama. Explain as you will the reasons for this, the fact remains. Does it not seem that the closely associated ideas of *primitive* and of *instinctive* goodness were theoretical conceptions which pleased his fancy and gave him a *point de départ* from which to attack the shortcomings of his own time, but did not really form part of his own actual experience, did not harmonize with his own struggle-filled life, which showed so clearly the presence of evil tendencies that must be overcome by actual combat against one's natural inclinations? If Rousseau did not always hold to this latter view, the fact but shows how his theories sometimes led him away from the rock bottom of tested experience. The *Nouvelle Héloïse* is in the main truer to life. "*La Nouvelle Héloïse*," says M. Lanson, "est dans le plan du réel."³⁹ As between the three conceptions of "la bonté naturelle," primitive goodness, instinctive goodness, and goodness that is natural to the best in man, we find most prominently emphasized in the *Nouvelle Héloïse*, not the second, the untenable doctrine that has often been considered as summing up all of Rousseau's thought, nor the first, which is opposed to all modern evolutionary ideas, but the third, which portrays man's higher nature warring for the victory against the evil in his lower nature, a doctrine which does in fact seem most in accord with daily experience.

Rousseau, as we have seen, uses *nature* in a majority of cases to indicate a primitive state or character, which is non-artificial and good, but this prehistoric state must in no way be confused with the present, for man now is not good but possesses bad tendencies

³⁹ G. Lanson, "L'unité de la pensée de J. J. Rousseau," *Annales de la Société J. J. Rousseau*, VIII, p. 24.

and must fight to overcome these evil inclinations. Hence virtue requires a moral struggle. It is no easy road. In proportion to the success of this struggle will man recover his primitive goodness and divest himself of artificial accretions, which are "unnatural" and bad. The contrast between Rousseau's idealistic attitude toward the past and his realistic estimate of the present helps to explain many of the seeming contradictions in his thought. It is a contrast which should be taken into account by modern criticism.

The true significance of the doctrine of natural goodness may easily escape us at this distance from the eighteenth century. Especially is this the case if emphasis is placed upon the false psychology patent in any theory of instinctive goodness literally interpreted. But its real significance lies elsewhere. To those who held a horrible belief in the eternal damnation of unbaptized infants or of the non-elect⁴⁰ it preached the gospel that any one might be freed from his sin regardless of his creed, a belief which is now becoming a commonplace of our daily thought. To many others, devoted to *salon* and *boudoir* life, it called for an about-face toward a wholesome frankness, simplicity and naturalness.⁴¹ It opposed fatalism and *laissez faire* and called man to fulfil a nobler mission than in the past and to realize the highest possibilities of his nature. These are its permanent contributions to the cause of civilization. For them it deserves to be remembered.⁴²

GEORGE R. HAVENS.

Ohio State University.

⁴⁰ Cf. W. E. H. Lecky, *History of the Rise and Influence of the Spirit of Rationalism in Europe* (N. Y., 1886), I, pp. 357 ff.

⁴¹ Cf. G. Lanson, *Histoire de la littérature française* (14th ed., 1918), p. 784.

⁴² For helpful suggestions made during the composition of this article, I am very grateful to Professors G. Chinard, E. P. Dargan, H. C. Lancaster, and A. O. Lovejoy. It is a pleasure to acknowledge their kindness.

PERSONAL AND LITERARY RELATIONS OF HAUPTMANN AND WEDEKIND *

According to Paul Schlenther, the official Hauptmann-biographer, Gerhart Hauptmann spent the summer of 1888 in Zürich, Switzerland.¹ It was during that summer that he made the acquaintance of Wedekind. "Außerdem gehörten Gerhart Hauptmann und Mackay zu unserem Kreis," Wedekind writes in an autobiographic sketch.²

The vast Hauptmann-literature is silent on this subject. Two critics³ of Wedekind briefly refer to the meeting of the two poets. They also make mention of the fact that Hauptmann used Wedekind as the prototype of Robert in *Das Friedensfest*, and that Wedekind avenged himself by introducing Hauptmann as the naturalistic poet Meier in his comedy *Die junge Welt*; but no one has apparently attempted to compare the resemblances in the two plays with the actual events in the lives of the two dramatists. Such a detailed comparison is the purpose of this paper.

For the facts of Wedekind's life we are practically restricted to the above-mentioned autobiographic sketch. The parallels with *Das Friedensfest* are striking.

Robert in *Das Friedensfest* says of his father, "Ein Mann, der als Arzt in türkischen Diensten gestanden" (p. 31).⁴ Wedekind reports, "Mein Vater . . . war Arzt und war als solcher zehn Jahre lang in Diensten des Sultans in der Türkei gereist."

In another place Robert continues, "Anno 48 hat Vater auf den Barrikaden angefangen" (p. 92). Wedekind relates, "Er saß 1848 als Kondeputierter (Ersatzmann) im Frankfurter Parlament."

* A paper read before the German section at the meeting of the Modern Language Association, held at Poughkeepsie, December 30th, 1920.

¹ Paul Schlenther, *Gerhart Hauptmann—Leben und Werke*, 1912, p. 33.

² "Autobiographisches von Wedekind" (niedergeschrieben 1901 in München für Ferdinand Hardekopf) *Pan*, 1911, p. 147 ff.

³ Hans Kempner, *Frank Wedekind als Mensch und Künstler*, Berlin-Pankow, 1911. Artur Kutscher in *Das Wedekindbuch*, München und Leipzig, 1914, p. 196.

⁴ All references to *Das Friedensfest* are to vol. 3 of the *Gesammelte Werke*, 1906.

Robert remarks, "Ein Mann von vierzig heiratet ein Mädchen von sechzehn" (p. 30). Wedekind tells the following: "Mit 46 Jahren heiratete er eine junge Schauspielerin, die genau halb so alt war wie er selber. Diese Tatsache scheint mir nicht ohne Bedeutung." This latter phrase seems to point to an incompatibility between Wedekind's parents, a fact which Hauptmann apparently utilized in Wilhelm's remarks, "Mutter und Vater haben auch ihr Leben lang verschiedene Sprachen gesprochen" (p. 99), and in the cynical outburst of Robert, "Na, und danach ist es denn auch geworden; ein stehender, fauler, gährender Sumpf, dem wir zu entstammen das zweifelhafte Vergnügen haben. Haarsträubend! Liebe—keine Spur. Gegenseitiges Verständnis—Achtung—nicht Rühren—und dies ist das Beet, auf dem wir Kinder gewachsen sind" (p. 31).

With reference to her origin, Frau Scholz says, "Ich bin eben 'ne einfache Seele—der Vater war eben zu vornehm für mich.—Seine Mutter hatte ooch so was Vornehmes. Aber mei' Vater war früher bluttarm—in mir steckt eben das Armutsblutt!" (p. 80). Wedekind narrates, "Mein Vater, aus alter friesischer Adelsfamilie—Der Vater meiner Mutter war ein Self-mademan. Er hatte als ungarischer Mausefallenhändler angefangen."

The taint of insanity in the Scholz-family is paralleled by Wedekind's report about his grandfather, "Er starb in voller Geistesumnachtung." The musical ability in Frau Scholz and in Wilhelm reminds of Wedekind's remark, "Er (der Vater seiner Mutter) war im hohen Grade musikalisch begabt. Was meine Schwester Erika und meine Wenigkeit an musikalischer Begabung besitzen, stammt entschieden von ihm."

Toward the end of the play Robert speaks of his vocation, "Sieh 'mal, ich gehe jetzt in ein kleines geheiztes Comtoirchen, setze mich mit dem Rücken an den Ofen—kreuze die Beine unter dem Tisch—zünde mir diese . . . selbe Pfeife hier an und schreibe—in aller Gemütsruhe hoffentlich, solche . . . na, du weißt schon, solche Scherze, . . . solche Reklamescherze: Afrikareisender . . . nahe am Verschmachten, na . . . und da laß ich denn gewöhnlich eine Karawane kommen, die unseren Artikel führt.—Mein Chef ist sehr zufrieden—es geht durch den Inseratenteil aller möglichen Zeitungen" (p. 91). Wedekind's sketch contains the following passage, "1886 wurde in Kempthal bei Zürich das indes weltberühmt ge-

wordene Etablissement Maggi für Suppenwürze gegründet. Maggi engagierte mich gleich bei der Gründung als Vorsteher seines Reklame- und Pressbureaus." As a matter of fact, I remember distinctly having seen German children playing with the colored Maggi-cards, bearing the picture of the poor explorer, saved from starvation by the timely arrival of a caravan carrying the Maggi-goods,

Even the mask of Robert bears a striking resemblance to a picture of Wedekind dating back to 1889, which is very different from those of his later years. This picture⁵ shows a slim figure, with wan face, mustache and goatee. Hauptmann describes Robert as follows: "Mittelgroß, schwächling, im Gesicht hager und blaß, Seine Augen liegen tief und leuchten zuweilen krankhaft. Schnurr- und Kinnbart" (p. 24).

Apparently Wedekind had at that time gone thru the extreme of cynicism and pessimism, as is indicated by the three pantomimes unearthed by Artur Kutscher.⁶ But even then he had that ruthless impulse to speak the truth as he saw it, that loathing of cheap sentimentality and emotionalism, of philistine morality and of moral compromises, which led him to deny the very existence of morals and of ideals. He had seen the contradictions of life and of civilization.

Fortunately, Carl Hauptmann has given us an interesting picture of the Wedekind of 1888: "Ich habe die Freude, Frank Wedekind seit seiner Frühzeit zu kennen, seit der Zeit, wo er in Zürich studierte. Der Mensch mit den edel beherrschten Zügen konnte im nächsten Augenblicke wie in mystischer Verwandlung auch immer der melancholische oder tolle Gaukler sein, der sein blutendes, aus der Brust gerissenes Herz wie ein tanzendes Rad über den Jahrmarkt trieb." And speaking of the later Wedekind, he continues, "Es handelt sich um das von der Urleidenschaft 'Leben' und 'Liebe' zerrissene Menschenherz, mit dem er seine Gaukeleien betreibt. . . Ein hochgradig erregter Erkennen unsrer Lebenstriebe zerquält seine Seele."⁷

Wedekind is the idealist turned cynic, who with all his antics cannot free his soul from the idealistic impulse. Some of that early

⁵ See *Wedekindbuch*, opp. p. 12.

⁶ Cf. *Wedekindbuch*, p. 194.

⁷ L. c., p. 117.

idealism, child-like purity and longing for the infinite is found in a few of his lyrics. The anguish of soul, which longs for harmony and sees only the meaningless contradictions of life, has found expression in the remarkable poem

Selbstzersetzung.⁸

Hochheil'ge Gebete, die fromm ich gelernt,
Ich stellte sie frech an den Pranger;
Mein kindlicher Himmel, so herrlich besternt,
Ward wüsten Gelagen zum Anger.

Ich schalt meinen Gott einen schläfrigen Wicht;
Ich schlug ihm begeistert den Stempel
Heillosen Betrugs ins vergränte Gesicht
Und wies ihn hinaus aus dem Tempel.

Da stand ich allein im erleuchteten Haus
Und ließ mir die Seele zerwühlen
Von grausiger Wonne, vom wonnigen Graus:
Als Tier und als Gott mich zu fühlen.

Auch hab' ich den mörderischen Kampf in der Brust,
Am Altar gelehnt, übernachtet,
Und hab' mir, dem Gotte, zu Kurzweil und Lust,
Mich selber zum Opfer geschlachtet.

Such an idealist turned cynic is also Hauptmann's Robert. Several times Hauptmann uses such stage-directions as, "er lächelt ironisch" (p. 66), "lacht bitter" (p. 69, 80) and has him exclaim "lachhaft . . . direkt komisch" (p. 73). His own sister calls him "pietätlos" (p. 26) and "schamlos" (p. 27). When he finds himself moved by the emotional appeal of the Christmas-celebration and the sunny idealism of Ida and Frau Buchner, he disdainfully and, as it were involuntarily, utters the word "Kinderkomödie" (p. 70). He actually experiences physical pain. "Robert scheint gegen Ende des Gesanges unter den Tönen physisch zu leiden. Die Unmöglichkeit sich dem Eindruck derselben zu entziehen, scheint ihn zu foltern und immer mehr und mehr zu erbittern" (p. 69). While conversing with his brother he mutters "Akrobatenseele" (p. 61) and confesses, "ich habe das unabweisbare Bedürfnis mich selbst anzuspucken."

In the spirit of *Selbstzersetzung*, he says to his mother, who has

⁸ Frank Wedekind, *Gesammelte Werke*, 1912, I, 76.

used the pious phrase, "der liebe Gott wird mich schon bei Zeiten erlösen!" . . . "Von Gott erlöst sein, möchte man lieber!" (p. 81).

Hauptmann has motivated Robert's cynicism thru the horrible home-life of the Scholz-family and the cruel and unfeeling education received at the hands of his father and his teachers. "Volle zehn Stunden täglich hockten wir über den Büchern." Wilhelm tells Ida, "da spielten sich Szenen ab—Mutter zog mich am linken, Vater am andern Arm. . . . Wir wehrten uns . . . natürlich half das nichts, unser Dasein wurde nur noch unerträglicher. . . . Wir waren ja zu der Zeit erst Jungens von neun oder zehn Jahren, und von da ab hörte die gute Absicht auf. . . . Fünf Jahre lang waren wir uns selbst überlassen. . . . Banditen und Tagediebe waren wir. . . . Wir verfielen aber noch auf ganz andre Dinge, deren Folgen wir wohl kaum jemals verwinden werden" (p. 47).

I am inclined to believe that this is also the explanation of Wedekind's cynicism. I have no direct evidence, except possibly the vitriolic way, in which he caricatures the teaching profession in such characters as Rektor Sonnenstich and Professors Affenschmalz, Knüppeldick, Hungergurt, Knochenbruch, Zungenschlag and Fliegentod in *Frühlings Erwachen*. But there is a startlingly reminiscent passage in *Tod und Teufel*, where the philosophic white-slaver Casti Piani breaks out, "Was ich als Kind erlebt habe, das erlebt kein menschliches Geschöpf, ohne daß seine Tatkraft bis zum Grabe gebrochen ist. Können Sie sich in einen jungen Menschen hineindenken, der mit sechzehn Jahren noch geprügelt wird, weil ihm der Logarithmus von Pi nicht in den Kopf will?! und der mich prügelte, war mein Vater! Und ich prügelte wieder! Ich habe meinen Vater totgeprügelt!"⁹ Does not this incident remind one of the box on the ear, which Wilhelm Scholz gave to his father? And did Wedekind perhaps draw on his own experiences, when he makes Casti Piani continue, "Ich habe . . . nie mehr die Beschimpfungen gehört, die während meiner ganzen Kindheit meiner Mutter zuteil wurden. . . . Aber das sind Kleinigkeiten. Die Ohrfeigen, Faustschläge und Fußtritte, in denen Vater, Mutter und ein Dutzend Lehrer zur Entwürdigung meines wehrlosen Körpers wetteiferten, waren Kleinigkeiten im Vergleich mit den

⁹ Frank Wedekind, *Gesammelte Werke*, v, 19 f. (1913).

Ohrfeigen, Fußtritten und Faustschlägen, in denen die Schicksale dieses Lebens miteinander wetteiferten, um meine wehrlose Seele zu entwürdigen."

Wedekind is the absolute individualist, who will brook no interference with the full play of his instincts. Robert Scholz asserts, "Das muß jedem unbenommen bleiben . . . sich auf seine Art zu vergnügen. Ich wenigstens würde mir dieses Recht auf keine Weise verkümmern lassen, selbst nicht durch Gesetze" (p. 29). In another place he says, "Ich bin, wie ich bin. Ich habe ein Recht so zu sein, wie ich bin" (p. 92).

The foregoing parallels are as much as, with our limited knowledge of Wedekind's early life, we can claim as direct influence. It is very probable, however, that many other details are taken from Wedekind's experiences, for he felt deeply wounded by Hauptmann's betrayal of his confidence.

He took his revenge in the little-known comedy *Die junge Welt*, written according to Wedekind's own testimony in 1889, but not published until 1897.¹⁰ In this light comedy, he introduces Hauptmann in the disguise of the naturalistic poet, Franz Ludwig Meier, "ein Jüngling mit bartlosem Antlitz, starkem Haarwuchs, während des ganzen Stückes in Jägerscher Normalkleidung." Meier is a naturalist, going about with pencil and note-book and writing down his observations. In the end he goes crazy, as he himself admits, "Wenn ich meine naturalistischen Studien an Alma machte, dann wurde Alma unnatürlich. Wenn ich meine naturalistischen Studien an einem andren Objekt machte, dann wurde sie eifersüchtig. So blieb mir denn weiter nichts übrig, als meine naturalistischen Studien an mir selber zu machen. Und das hat mir den Rest gegeben" (p. 88). In this passage Wedekind satirizes the craze of the young naturalists to outdo Zola in his scientific observation of life. Gerhart Hauptmann still adhered to this notebook-habit at the time of his journey to Greece.¹¹

Meier is the editor of the as yet not fully launched "Sonne," and as he boasts of how he has overcome one obstacle after the other, he exclaims, "Die 'Sonne' harrt gewissermaßen nur noch meines

¹⁰ Frank Wedekind, *Gesammelte Werke*, II, 1-91 (1912).

¹¹ "Ich schreibe meiner Gewohnheit nach, im Gehen, mit Bleistift diese Notizen." Gerhart Hauptmann, *Griechischer Frühling*, Berlin, 1908, p. 40.

Winkes, um aufzugehen" (p. 64). This remark is clearly an allusion to Hauptmann's first play *Vor Sonnenaufgang*, which is further referred to by Karl Rappart, "Sein erstes realistisches Sittendrama erschien. . . . Er hatte . . . einen Riesenerfolg. Das Wiederaufblühen der deutschen Literatur schien durch Meier verbürgt. Leider erlebte sein Stück nur einige Aufführungen, indem es auch eigentlich keinem Menschen gefallen hatte; und man verlangte etwas Neues von ihm.—Und nun kommt sein Geniestreich." And with an emotional seriousness quite uncommon in Wedekind, which shows how deeply he felt hurt, Wedekind has Karl continue: "Ich hätte Meier damals auf den Knien dafür danken können, in ihm wenigstens einen Menschen zu haben, dem ich mein übergroßes Herz ausschütten konnte. . . . Und dieser Mensch geht hin und setzt meine Seelenergüsse, Wort für Wort, stenographiert gewissermaßen, seinem Theaterpublikum als realistische Delikatesse vor! Er mußte sich, während die Geschichte spielte, schon die genauesten Notizen gemacht haben. Die Tage werden mir unvergeßlich sein. Ich sitze von früh bis spät allein in meiner Mansarde, über meinen Zeitungsartikeln, um mir abends meinen einsamen Tee mit einem Stück Wurst illustrieren zu können. Der Abend kommt, die Wurst kommt, dann kommt Meier von einem opulenten Diner, streckt sich auf den Diwan, gähnt, bewitzelt meinen ärmlichen Luxus, und angesichts seiner Glückseligkeit geht mir das Herz auf. Meier lacht sich derweil ins Fäustchen und denkt: Das gibt eine prachtvolle Bühnenfigur! . . . Wenn sich der Realist noch wenigstens an die Realität gehalten hätte. Aber die war ihm natürlich nicht realistisch genug! Da mußte ein Vater her, den kein Mensch mit der Feuerzange anfassen würde; eine Mutter, die kein Mensch mit der Feuerzange anfassen würde. . . . Und alle diese Schauergestalten, diese Mißgeburten sehe ich mit meinen Worten, mit meinem Seelenschmerz, mit meinen Erlebnissen und Empfindungen aufgeputzt" (p. 75 f.).

Then follows a turn to the grotesque in Wedekind's best style: "Das Stück wird aufgeführt. Ich sehe mich vom ersten Helden-darsteller gespielt. Eine fürchterliche Sensation aber—damit war es auch aus. Es hatte nicht gefallen. Und nun denke dir, nun kommt Meier zu mir und macht mich für seinen Mißerfolg verantwortlich. Er sagte, er habe sich genau an meine Mitteilungen gehalten; entweder müsse ich ihm was vorgelogen haben, oder ich

sei ein verschrobener Mensch, der sein Leben nicht realistisch richtig zu leben verstände. Nun sah ich mich noch dazu unsterblich lächerlich geworden. Natürlich beschäftigten sich die Zeitungen mit dem Fall. Es ging so weit, daß die Straßenjugend mit Fingern auf mich zeigte" (p. 77).

Viciously Wedekind hints at Hauptmann's marital troubles, which must have begun about then. "Seine junge Frau hielt anfangs so tapfer, so geduldig bei ihm aus, wie er es sich nur hätte wünschen können. Nun hat er ihr aber so lange und eindrucklich gepredigt, daß ihre Gegenwart überhaupt die wesentliche Ursache seiner Gemütsleiden sei, daß sie schließlich vollkommen an sich irre geworden ist und sich zu allem bereit erklärt." This and earlier passages read almost like a take-off on Hauptmann's *Einsame Menschen*,¹² provided they were inserted later than 1890. As Anna Mahr in *Einsame Menschen*, so Anna Lauhart is a "Studierende der Medizin" (p. 27), who has been in Zürich and in Paris (p. 39), and Meier talks of matrimony much as Johannes Vockerat as an "Einklang der Seelen" (p. 34) and as "ein auf sittlicher Grundlage basierendes, lebenslängliches, ernstes Zusammenwirken, Zusammenstreben" (p. 62). One is tempted to assume, that when Wedekind makes Karl say to Meier's wife Alma, "Fürchten Sie denn nicht, meine Gnädigste, daß Ihnen das einsame Leben noch trostloser werden könnte als Ihre Häuslichkeit. . . ?" (p. 86) he is poking fun at Hauptmann's play.

Finally a cheap reconciliation takes place between Alma and Meier, and she agrees to try her luck with him once more, "Aber ohne—ohne—ohne—Notizbuch" (p. 91).

Wedekind never forgave Hauptmann, as is proved by several flippant references to the naturalist in later works, and Gerhart Hauptmann did not contribute to the book issued in honor of Wedekind's fiftieth birthday.

FREDERICK W. J. HEUSER.

Columbia University.

¹² For similar passages in *Einsame Menschen*, cf. pp. 131, 132 and 216.

THE DRAMAS OF RICHARD CUMBERLAND, 1779-1785

Richard Cumberland's sentimental masque, *Calypso*, was acted March 20, 1779, at Covent Garden Theatre. This play tells a moral tale of the struggle of Telemachus to resist Calypso. On a "rocky shore, wild and desart," (I, i) Calypso mourns Ulysses, and even Proteus can give no news of the wanderer. Telemachus is wrecked upon the island, and, despite the protests of Mentor, yields to Calypso. He is moved to repentance by discovering the real wickedness of Calypso, and, with the moral awakening of Telemachus, the palace of Calypso vanishes. "The plot," as *Biographia Dramatica* (III, 77) says, "is well known to every school boy and girl who has read Telemachus," and "the adventures of Telemachus, in different shapes, have already surfeited the world. Opera, masque, and Tragedy have all maintained this hero in a languishing kind of existence." Calypso was, however, effective as eighteenth-century stage-craft. "It has," says *The London Review* for March, "something in it picturesque and poetical, we wish we could say equally dramatic and theatrical; but in these points it is somewhat defective, altho' we think it by no means so deficient as our play-house and newspaper critics pretend." The prophecy of *The London Magazine* for April that *Calypso* was "not likely to outlive the nine nights that include three benefits" was true, since the masque was acted but three times. *Calypso* must be set down as one more unfortunate experiment by Cumberland in a field for which he was totally unfitted.¹

The Bondman, an adaptation of Massinger's play, was acted on October 13, 1779. It is probable that the play was offered to the world anonymously. *The Public Advertiser* of October 14 reviews it, "altered, as 'tis said, by Mr. Hall." *The Bondman* was "acted only about six nights."²

The failure of *The Duke of Milan*, acted November 10, 1779, at Covent Garden, marked Cumberland's third unsuccessful attempt

¹ Cumberland says that *Calypso* was written to bring Butler forward, *Mémoires*, I, 800. See *The Widow of Delphi*. Further comment upon *Calypso* may be found in the *St. James Chronicle* of March 23, 1779; *The London Chronicle* of March 22, 1779, and Genest, VI, 95.

² *Biographia Dramatica*, III, 64. Further comment upon *The Bondman* may be found in *The London Chronicle* of October 15, 1779; *Lloyd's Evening Post* of October 13, 1779, and in Boaden, *Life of Mrs. Siddons*, p. 117.

within two years to adapt Elizabethan tragedies. Revision of the plays of Shakespeare, of Massinger, or even of Fenton, could never result with any degree of credit to Cumberland, since he was in no sense a writer of good tragedies, nor even a capable adapter of them. Exactly what he professes in his Advertisement to *Timon of Athens* he never achieves, namely, the bringing of plays "upon the stage with less violence to their authors, and not so much responsibility on his part."³

Cumberland now turned again to musical comedy. On February 1, 1780, Covent Garden Theatre advertised *The Widow of Delphi*, or *The Descent of the Deities*. The author's powers in this species of drama had not improved. *The Widow of Delphi* was performed six times.⁴

The Walloons, written during Cumberland's sojourn in Spain as ambassador, was acted April 20, 1782, at Covent Garden. On January 28, 1783, there appeared at the same theatre *The Mysterious Husband*, a good example of eighteenth-century domestic tragedy. Lord Davenant, the villain, was played by Henderson. "Well, Mr. Cumberland," Mrs. Henderson is reported to have said, "I hope at last you will allow Mr. Henderson to be good for something on the stage." "Madam," replied the poet, "I can't afford it—a villain he must be."⁵ This was Henderson's third appearance as Cumberland's leading character in a tragedy. Certain lines in the prologue of *The Mysterious Husband* have interest as a possible allusion to *The Critic*:

Now parody has ventured all its spite
Let Tragedy resume her ancient right.*

³ *Memoirs*, I, 384. The prologue of *The Duke of Milan* was said to be written *en revanche* for the attack on Cumberland in *The Critic*. Further comment upon *The Duke of Milan* may be found in *Lloyd's Evening Post* of November 15, 1779.

⁴ Further comment upon *The Widow of Delphi* may be found in *The Westminster Magazine* for February, 1780; *The Town and Country Magazine* for February, 1780; *The Universal Magazine* for February, 1780; *The London Chronicle* of February 2, 1780; *The Public Advertiser* of February 1, and February 2, 1780; *Biographia Dramatica*, IV, 405, Mudford, *Life of Cumberland*, p. 341; and Genest, VI, 146.

⁵ *Life of Mrs. Siddons*, p. 229.

* Further comment upon *The Mysterious Husband* may be found in *The Lady's Magazine* for February, 1783; *The Critical Review* for February,

The Carmelite, a so-called Gothic tragedy, was acted with some measure of success at Drury Lane on December 2, 1784. Mrs. Siddons won fame as Matilda. On the twenty-second of the same month appeared a sentimental comedy of Cumberland's, *The Natural Son*. The story of this piece follows: Blushenly, without name or fortune, but with all the other graces of a sentimental comedy hero, escapes the meshes of Phoebe, an elderly spinster, and wins, in spite of his diffidence, the hand of Lady Paragon. Rueful, moved to remorse by the virtues of his natural son, Blushenly, acknowledges him, and repents publicly of his wrong-doing. *The Natural Son* is sadly deficient in incident for a five-act play, and the December *Westminster Magazine* points out that "it must require a considerable husbandry to draw out so slight a fable into five acts." This fault, and Cumberland's ancient weakness of firing all his artillery in the first two acts, destroyed a promising comedy. "It has of late," says *The Universal Magazine* for the same month, "been remarkably the lot of the theatres to produce plays which began well, and sink both in interest and effect as they proceeded. *The Natural Son* is a piece which comes within this description. The first and second acts are good ones, and though there are many happy incidents, excellent sentiments, and pointed witticisms and remarks in the third, fourth and fifth, yet considered as acts, they are by no means equal to those that precede them. It were to be wished that Mr. Cumberland had compressed his plot, and written the comedy in three acts only; all would then have been alive and interesting."

Cumberland, with undying belief that any "unequal production"⁷ of his, if properly cared for, would ultimately succeed, reduced the five acts of *The Natural Son* to four, and the play in this form was acted at Drury Lane on June 10, 1794. "The omissions," says *The European Magazine*, "were chiefly the exclusion of a character called Rueful, which certainly added nothing to the merit of the play. In its present state it is much improved."⁸ The worth of *The Natural Son*—and it has worth—

1783; *Aikin's Review* for 1783; Genest, vi, 268; Mudford, p. 413; Oulton, *History of the Theatres of London*, II, 2; and Dunlap, *Life of George Frederick Cooke*, I, 338, 341, 343.

⁷ *The London Chronicle*, December 25, 1784.

⁸ *The European Magazine*, June, 1794.

lies partly in "well delineated character."⁹ Cumberland was bold enough to use old wine. Major O'Flaherty re-appears, and is effective, although he lacks the wit of earlier days. "Upon the whole well contrived," is one judgment, though the same writer laments that "Major O'Flaherty throws sad disgrace on young Dudley,"¹⁰ for the votaries of the early play knew the promise that "Dudley made . . . at the conclusion of the *West Indian*,"¹¹ and now the Major is "totally unprovided for."¹² In the production of a decade later the Major's name "was changed to Captain O'Carol."¹³ *Biographia Dramatica* praises the characters of Rueful and Dumps, and *The Westminster Magazine* discerns in "Jack Husting's first interview with Sir Jeoffrey, and his address to Miss Phoebe . . . abundant humour."

The Arab, or *Alcanor*, acted March 8, 1785, at Covent Garden Theatre, has the familiar Cumberland plot: Mariamne, the former queen, having been imprisoned, the royal Augusta exults over the faded charms of her rival. Herodian, the son of Mariamne, has returned only to find his mother dethroned, while Alcanor, lost for years past in the desert, arrives as the heir-presumptive, magnificent in his simplicity, his naïveté, his fierce and generous passions. When he is made aware of the just claims of Herodian to the throne, in spite of the imprecations of Augusta, he yields the kingdom to his rival. Shortly afterwards, he learns that Glaphyra loves and is loved by Herodian. Since Alcanor has earlier saved the maiden's life, and loves her, this crisis is the supreme test of his generous nature. He wavers, sending Barzilla, who proves to be his own father, to kill Herodian, but virtue conquers, and Alcanor's suicide liberates Herodian and Glaphyra. In all likelihood, *Salome*, a lost tragedy by Cumberland, *The Arab*, as acted at Covent Garden, and *Alcanor*, as found in *The Posthumous Dramatick Works*, are successive versions of the same drama. In letters to Garrick in 1770 Cumberland describes *Salome*, and says he has made her life "twice attempted by Mariamne."¹⁴ "If yet,"

⁹ *Biographica Dramatica*, IV, 74.

¹⁰ *The Westminster Magazine*, December, 1784.

¹¹ *Idem*.

¹² *Idem*.

¹³ Genest, VI, 152.

¹⁴ *Private Correspondence of David Garrick*, I, 380, Cumberland to Garrick, January 25, 1770.

he writes two months later; "the catastrophe is too shocking, by the danger in which Glaphyra is kept, I have a plan for softening that, though I am humbly of the opinion it has a very great effect as it is."¹⁵ What became of the unfortunate *Salome* it is impossible to tell, but the mention of the characters of Mariamne, Glaphyra, and Bethanor links the lost play with both *The Arab* and *Alcanor*. Mariamne appears in *Alcanor*, Bethanor in *The Arab*, and Glaphyra in both. The relationship of *The Arab* to *Alcanor* is clear. *Biographia Dramatica* does not realize that these are essentially the same play.¹⁶ Listed as separate plays, *The Arab* is said to have been never published, and *Alcanor* never performed. *Alcanor* is, in fact, a later evolution of *The Arab*. Of *The Arab's dramatis personæ* of five characters, two, Herodian and Glaphyra, reappear in *Alcanor*. Contemporary references to incidents of *The Arab* prove that the plots were substantially alike. "There can hardly be a doubt," says Genest of *The Arab*, "that this is the T. published in Cumberland's posthumous works as *Alcanor*."¹⁷ *The Arab* was acted but once. In the cast were Henderson, Lewis, Wroughton, Mrs. Bates,¹⁸ and Miss Young. "This tragedy," says *The London Magazine* for March, 1785, "abounds in business; some of the incidents are effected by great contrivance and ingenuity. Several of the situations are as full of force as any we have observed in tragedies of a late period. Glaphira's avowal of Herodian being her lover; the confession Bathanor¹⁹ [*sic*] makes, of his being the father of Abidah;²⁰ the interview between Herodian and Glaphira; and the death of Bathanor, deserve particular attention. The language is full of imagery, some of which possesses novelty. The tragedy was well got up, and the performers played with infinite spirit." At his last benefit Henderson²¹ acted the

¹⁵ *Idem.*, March 17, 1770.

¹⁶ *Biographia Dramatica: The Arab*, III, 35, *Alcanor*, III, 12.

¹⁷ Genest, VI, 360.

¹⁸ Mrs. Bates acted regularly at Drury Lane.

¹⁹ Bethanor = Barzilla in the play of *Alcanor*.

²⁰ Abidah = Alcanor in the play of *Alcanor*.

²¹ In the *Memoirs*, II, 207, Cumberland says: "I have now in my mind's eye that look he (Henderson) gave me, so comically conscious of taking what his judgment told him he ought to refuse, when I put into his hand my tributary guineas for the few places I had taken in his theatre: 'If I were not the most covetous dog in creation,' he cried, 'I should not take your money; but I cannot help it.'"

part of *Alcanor* with success. A friend, E. T., wrote to him: "I saw in one paper, Bensley preferred to you in *Horatius*. I have not seen your *Horatius*, but I have your *Alcanor*, and I am sure your *Horatius* must be good."²²

From this time on Cumberland's pen was never idle. During the Summer Season at the Haymarket Theatre was produced *The Country Attorney*. It was withdrawn after the fourth performance. Genest (VI, 452) gives the number of performances of *The Country Attorney* as four, but *The Theatrical Register* of *The Gentleman's Magazine* records six. The play was never printed, and Cumberland hardly mentions it in the *Memoirs* (II, 278). *The European Magazine* justly calls *The Country Attorney* "one of those hasty productions by which Mr. Cumberland has been gradually writing down his reputation, ever since the appearance of the *West Indian*."²³

STANLEY T. WILLIAMS.

Yale University.

WORDSWORTH BANDIES JESTS WITH MATTHEW

Three stanzas from Wordsworth's poem *The Tables Turned* have always held a very prominent place in the minds of all his readers. They are the following:

Books! 'tis a dull and endless strife:
Come hear the woodland linnet,
How sweet his music! on my life,
There's more of wisdom in it.

And hark! how blithe the throstle sings!
He, too, is no mean preacher:
Come forth into the light of things,
Let Nature be your Teacher.

²² *The European Magazine*, July, 1787. Further comment upon *The Country Attorney* may be found in *The Town and Country Magazine* for July, 1787; *The London Chronicle* of July 9, 1787; Adolphus, *Life of John Bannister*, I, 160; *Memoirs of Mrs. Crouch*, II, 24, 56; and Mudford, p. 547.

²³ *Letters and Poems by the late Mr. John Henderson*, p. 213, E. T. to Henderson, November 13, 1777. Further comment upon *The Arab* may be found in the *Memoirs of Mrs. Crouch*, I, 238.

One impulse from a vernal wood
May teach you more of man,
Of moral evil and of good,
Than all the sages can.

The entire poem, to be sure, but particularly these lines have been regarded as Wordsworth's most concise and memorable expression of his belief in the moral power of Nature. She, and not traditional wisdom, is to be regarded as man's surest ethical guide. Adverse critics of naturalistic morality of this sort, in particular, have fallen foul of this passage. Professor Irving Babbitt, for example, in *Rousseau and Romanticism* says, "Wordsworth . . . would have us believe that man is taught by 'woods and rills' and not by contact with his fellowmen. He pushes this latter paradox to a point that would have made Rousseau stare and gasp when he asserts that 'one impulse from a vernal wood,' etc."

The persistent use of this passage as though it were a direct and formal expression of Wordsworth's philosophy, is hardly justified. The entire poem, as a matter of fact, is essentially dramatic,¹ and helps to form our conception of one of the most original figures in all Wordsworth's poetry. These remarks compose one speech in a little comedy of character which runs through a number of his poems. Properly considered, they form a bit of indirect characterization of an engaging fellow, named Matthew. William, the poet, in them is making a vivacious reply to some teasing to which the old man, in *Expostulation and Reply*, has been subjecting him. William has at length caught the contagion of Matthew's spirit and turns the tables by answering him in just the tone in which he has pitched the argument.

Matthew's character, therefore, must be clearly understood by anyone who hopes to interpret these lines aright. This figure is

¹ Wordsworth, to be sure, in the Advertisement prefixed to the 1798 edition of *The Lyrical Ballads* says "the lines entitled 'Expostulation and Reply,' and those which follow, arose out of conversation with a friend who was somewhat unreasonably attached to books of moral philosophy." This conversation may even conceivably be the inconclusive "metaphysical argument" which Hazlitt records as having had with Wordsworth, in "My First Acquaintance with Poets." These facts, however interpreted, do not affect the nature of the obvious drama which has been built upon them as a base. Certainly no one will seek to find any of Hazlitt's features in Matthew.

an imaginative creation of Wordsworth's,—one of his most distinctive dramatic individuals. He is the central figure in *Matthew*, *The Two April Mornings*, *The Fountain*, and *Address to the Scholars of a Village School*,² besides being the moving spirit of the discussion carried on in *Expostulation and Reply* and *The Tables Turned*.³

This Matthew was built up, as were almost all of Wordsworth's fictions, on a strong basis of actual fact. He doubtless owes many of his most attractive traits to one of his author's teachers at Hawkshead,—The Rev. William Taylor.⁴ But Wordsworth, himself, explicitly warns us against identifying the two. In the Fenwick note to the poem called *Matthew*, the poet, after indicating the relation of its hero to this Taylor, says: "This and other poems connected with Matthew, would not gain by a literal detail of facts. Like the Wanderer in 'The Excursion,' this Schoolmaster was made up of several, both of his class and men of other occupations."

Matthew is conceived as being a merry old schoolmaster of seventy-two,⁵ with hair of glittering gray.⁶ Volatile in the extreme, at frequent intervals he is veritably possessed by mad gaiety. Robertson calls him "the most highly fantastical pedagogue whom we have in all poetic literature." Wordsworth tells us that he was:

As blithe a man as you could see
On a spring holiday.⁷

He calls him "the gray haired man of glee"⁸ and tells us that

² The fact that these poems were all written later than the two directly under discussion, does not weaken their value as supplementary descriptions of the dramatic figure to whom Wordsworth speaks in *The Tables Turned*.

³ I do not include, it will be noticed, lines 531 ff. in Prelude X, in which Wordsworth gives an account of a visit to the grave of an old schoolmaster. The person referred to is clearly an historical person, who here shows none of Matthew's distinctive qualities.

⁴ The entire question of the relation of this Matthew to real persons is exhaustively discussed by Eric Robertson in his *Wordsworth and the English Lake Country*, pp. 115-134.

⁵ *The Fountain*, 4.

⁷ *The Two April Mornings*, 7-8.

⁶ *The Two April Mornings*, 6.

⁸ *The Fountain*, 20.

The sighs which Matthew heaved were sighs
Of one tired out with fun and madness;
The tears which came to Matthew's eyes
Were tears of light, the dew of gladness.⁹

His mirth at times overflowed into improvised song. In *The Fountain* at least, the poet suggests that he and Matthew sing together

That half-mad thing of witty rhymes
Which you last April made.

But in the midst of Matthew's seizures of contagious animal gaiety, there would suddenly fall upon him trances of thought.

Yet sometimes, when the secret cup
Of still and serious thought went round,
It seemed as if he drank it up—
He felt with spirit so profound.¹⁰

These ideas, which come to him as suddenly as his moods of joy, have as random and gusty a character as they. A brief study of *The Fountain* will show how little regard he pays to logical consistency when the mood of thought is upon him. As he and the poet are lying near a woodland spring, the latter suggests that they sing together some of his songs. But Matthew does not hear; he is hypnotized by the approach of a thought. When it arrives, he ceases to stare with unseeing eyes at the fountain, and lets the oracle speak through him. Fugitive thoughts pour from his lips. Natural creatures, says the volatile spirit who is talking, enjoy a glorious freedom in comparison to man, who is beset by social laws which precipitate discord within his nature. The blackbird and the lark seem to him free to follow their impulses to natural happiness.

With Nature never do *they* wage
A foolish strife; they see
A happy youth, and their old age
Is beautiful and free.¹¹

But when Matthew comes to mention the heavy laws by which men are oppressed, he seems not to realize that they are laws of Nature to which the gayest birds are subject as inevitably as man. What

⁹ *Matthew*, 17-20.

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, 25-28.

¹¹ *The Fountain*, 41-44.

interests him, however, is that these natural laws of death and loss are indifferent facts to creatures devoid of memory, but are mournful to all men, and most mournful to a man of mirth like him. These wayward and incoherent inspirations of thought, however, produce in him no permanent sense of grief. The feeling proves as evanescent as all his moods, for, a few minutes later, as he and the poet walk away from the fountain, he begins to sing his

Witty rhymes
About the crazy old church-clock
And the bewildered chimes.

In this poem, as in all the others in which he appears, Matthew remains true to his character. He is no person to be taken with sustained seriousness. His thought is harmonious with his conduct; both are delightfully innocent of logic and consistency. Only those who deny Wordsworth even a boyish sense of fun, which took the place in his mind of a sense of humour, will allow their zeal for discovering the poet's philosophy to obscure this spirited characterization of Matthew.

Now when this impulsive old fantastic comes upon the poet idly dreaming on an old gray stone, he attacks him in his now familiar spirit of irresponsible and exaggerated badinage—"Why, William, you sit there mooning and gazing upon the landscape as though you were the first and only one of your kind. Come, get out your books and read them. Then you will learn that there have been great men in the world before you. Let their spirit breathe upon you with inspiration,—that will convert you from an eccentric solitary into a man among men."

Up! Up! and drink the spirit breathed
From dead men to their kind.

The spasmodic philosopher cares little whether or not this doctrine is inconsistent with that enunciated in *The Fountain*. The wide-eyed dreamer arouses one of Matthew's gusts of mad mirth and he takes the line that will give him the most fun.

William is at first so absorbed in his thoughts that he does not enter into the spirit of Matthew's gaiety. So in the last four stanzas of *Expostulation and Reply* he develops seriously and simply his theory of the value of a "wise passiveness" in the presence of Nature. Then he turns, as it were, and for the first time catches

the mirth in Matthew's eyes. He immediately recognizes the jocose spirit of his friend's attack and awaits his opportunity to retaliate. His chance is not long in coming. In the evening he finds Matthew reading, and assails what he is doing with the same spirit of exaggerated ardor¹² that his old friend had shown toward his out-of-door idling.

"Don't preach wisdom to me, my old book-worm. What folly to be bending double over your books when the sun is flooding the meadows with mellow lustre. Close up the barren leaves. Away with Science and Art. Come out and hear the linnet."

How sweet his music! on my life
There's more of wisdom in it.

"Come out into the light and let Nature be your Teacher."

Then follows the mooted stanza:

One impulse from a vernal wood
May teach you more of man,
Of moral evil and of good,
Than all the sages can.

The spirit of this retort, thus put into its proper setting, is unmistakable. William has donned the gay volatility of Matthew for a purpose. He indulges in his friend's irresponsible jesting with idea. How absurd, then, to think that here the poet is giving serious and measured utterance to his cherished ideas. He is beating down a merry adversary by mere exaggeration and volubility.

Wordsworth's attitude toward tradition, books, and wisdom, it must be admitted, is often puzzling, and, to the neo-humanist it must seem sometimes frankly obscurantist. In fact, Wordsworth so often preaches the moral value of mere association with Nature that he might have expressed ideas very like these, as his final wisdom.¹³ But in this poem he is jesting and it is annoying to

¹² Cf. Wordsworth's sub-title to *The Tables Turned*, "An Evening Scene on the Same Subject."

¹³ Especially the lines in *To My Sister*, published, like these two poems, in the first edition of *The Lyrical Ballads*, in particular the following lines:

One moment now may give us more
Than years of toiling reason:
Our minds shall drink at every pore
The spirit of the season.

see one of Wordsworth's few jokes so often taken in deadly earnest. Moreover, it is a pity not to recognize here a flash of sportive and vigorous dramatic ability in this predominantly philosophical poet. Most serious is such a literal-minded critic's loss of this, perhaps the most delightful, encounter which Wordsworth has arranged for his readers, with the old mad-cap Matthew.

OSCAR JAMES CAMPBELL.

University of Michigan.

FURTHER INTERPRETATIONS OF MILTON

In my endeavor to meet the doubts of certain scholarly gentlemen as to some of my recent conclusions in the interpretation of Milton, *MLN.* xxxv, 441, facts and considerations have presented themselves which seem to justify further request for the hospitality of these pages.

1. Milton's "star that bids the shepherd fold" (*Comus* 93) is often associated by the annotators with Shakespeare's "unfolding star" (*Meas. for Meas.* iv. ii, 218), and fittingly enough, for they are parts of the same conception. In my former communication I drew attention to the fact that in the Spring the constellation Leo (represented by the bright star Regulus) rises to the zenith as Aries sinks in the west. This suggests poetically the peril that causes the folding of the flock.

The unfolding star is Sirius (Canis Major), perhaps reinforced by Procyon (Canis Minor), which at the same season rises before Aries. Since the lion is the natural enemy of the flock as the dog is its natural protector, the former announces danger, the latter proclaims safety.

2. In the lines *On the Death of a Fair Infant* a more comprehensive view still more positively rejects the bracketed (Mercy) of line 53.

A note in Dr. Thomas Newton's edition (1753) says, "In some editions the title runs thus, *On the Death of a Fair Infant a Nephew of his dying of a cough*; but the sequel shows plainly that the child was not a nephew but a niece and consequently a daughter of his elder sister Anna Milton (Phillips)." But the

sequel is not so conclusive on this point as has been imagined. In the gross sense, of course, stern, masculine Winter wanted to wed a maiden, not a youth. The immaturity need not be considered. However, the body was not that which he coveted and snatched away, but the *anima*, soul, or physical life, and this is feminine whether in youth or maiden. (It is to be hoped that Milton's sister also understood so much Latin.) As we shall see, a part of the poem depends for its best sense upon the assumption that the child was a boy. Besides it is easier to understand how nephew was erroneously dropped than how it was erroneously inserted at first.

Of the precise words of line 53 I have rejected the bracketed (Mercy) and explained them as referring to Ganymede. "Would not Hylas do?" asks a cautious scholar. "Not so well," I maintain, "for he lacks that essential smile and is not associated with 'that heavenly brood' from which he ought to come." But we shall have a more convincing reason.

No one has deemed necessary a fuller identification of the "crowned Matron" who follows. She is received as a personification of Truth, sufficiently identified by the poet himself. She does indeed resemble Spenser's Una but she is more. She must have a place in the myths like her associates. She is Philosophy the Matron by eminence "the towered Cybele, mother of a hundred gods," all light-bearing divinities, "that heavenly brood" presently mentioned. Her temple at Athens was called the Μητρόων; she is white-robed, for the light is her garment (*Ps. civ. 2*). Her priests are called Galli (cocks) because of their office in heralding the day. Her name, Cybele or Cybebe, was apparently related by the young poet with κύβη or κεφαλῇ, that is, the head, the citadel of Truth's empire.

What was Milton's purpose in these references? We have seen that there is at least an even likelihood that the babe was a boy. Its tentative identification successively with a star (predominantly masculine), a goddess, a maid, a youth, a matron, one of the heavenly brood (divided between the sexes) and one of the "golden-winged host" of angels (presumably all masculine) shows how little was made of the sex relation.

Nothing is more usual at the death of a child than to forecast what it would have become if it had grown to manhood. Inasmuch as the Infant's father "held a situation in the Crown Office in

Chancery" what would be more natural than to expect the child at maturity to fill the place of a jurist? This would have been logical destiny, if the spirit of Astraea had grown up within the child. The Infant's uncle was a poet in embryo and more than that in prospect; the talent was in the blood: what could forbid the hope that the spirit of Ganymede fostered within the child would make him a poet, a purveyor of the nectar of the gods? Milton, when he wrote, was imbibing Greek philosophy at Cambridge with unconquerable zest; what if the same spirit of Cybele should develop in the child and make him a philosopher or one of the honored dons of the university? The departments from which to choose are as numerous as the divine offspring of the "crowned matron."

To return to the second possibility—that the Infant might become a poet. There are two main sources of inspiration, very real and positive sources, Joy and Sorrow. Milton has many studies of their varied manifestations in his poems early and late. They generally appear under names familiar in mythology, Pan and Sylvanus, Urania and Calliope, Ganymede and Hylas, Fauns and Nymphs. In more extended and intimate comparison they are portrayed in *L'Allegro* and *Il Penseroso*. The home of these two passions in the heart is hinted in *Par. Lost* iv. 705-8 based on *Prov.* xiv. 10. Ganymede and Hylas are paired in *Eleg. Sept.* 21-24. Ganymede, as his name indicates, is Joy; Hylas (ἵλη, wood), scarcely less beautiful and no less loved, is related to the sombre Sylvanus, like him associated with the Nymphs (Grief) and by them caught bathing in a shaded pool and born away into Neptune's realm, somewhat as Orpheus (the Bereaved), another variant of Sorrow, is carried "down the swift Hebrus to the Lesbian shore." Ganymede (Joy) is rapt by Jove's eagle into the sky and has his permanent abode in Olympus dispensing nectar to the gods. Is it credible that Milton could have preferred the sorrowful to the joyous mood for his nephew—Hylas to Ganymede?

A common doctrine is, that of the two portraits, *L'Allegro* and *Il Penseroso*, Milton resembled the latter. But it will hardly be denied that in his comparisons he steadfastly set the former in the higher place both of origin and power. Joy in Heaven is Euphrosyne, one of the Graces. Melancholy has no name there because she has no residence. Orpheus by his pathos was able to draw

"iron tears down Pluto's cheek" and wring a conditional release of his wife; but a song of joy in that dismal world would have revolutionized it and forced the grim monarch "to have quite set free the half-regained Eurydice."

Milton is in fact the most cheerful of poets; he utters a note of triumph amid the saddest personal privations and over the most disastrous events. This is not forced but spontaneous. The joy gushes from the base of his life like a fountain fed from the sky. The source is revealed in the consolation offered his sister in the closing lines of this poem.

It remains only to note that all who are designated, the jurist or statesman, the poet, the philosopher, or teacher, are "let down in cloudy throne to do the world some good." They are kings and though of ill-defined authority rule the spirit more effectually than many who sit on thrones of royal state.

3. On lines 76, 77 Masson remarks: "One can hardly say that this prophecy was fulfilled in Edward Phillips and John Phillips, Milton's nephews, the brothers of the fair Infant born after her (his?) death. Yet they are both remembered on their uncle's account." Masson must have felt—his hesitation shows it—that of all times at such a time as this professed divination with respect to his sister's natural descendants, had Milton been weak enough to attempt it, would have been a mockery. If we turn to the prophecy of *Isaiah* (Chap. LIV-LVI) we find consolations for childlessness whose exalted beauty and tenderness must have strongly appealed to Milton and impelled their application to his sister under the same conditions as those that occasioned their first utterance. The culmination of the promise is in chap. LVI. 5—"Even unto them will I give in my house and within my wall a place and a name better than of sons and daughters: I will give them an everlasting name that will not be cut off." Here is something far more substantial than poetic invention; it covers the ground of the scriptural promise even to its emphatic redundancy.

4. Let me venture in addition to the foregoing an interpretation of a well-known but poorly understood passage beginning with the fiftieth line of *Lycidas*. The first thing requiring settlement is the location of the *steep* in line 52. Why did Milton here use a descriptive term instead of the name as in the case of the other two localities? Was it not because he considered the steep to be

too well known to require naming? And yet editors have groped uncertainly for "it" among the unfamiliar mountains of Wales. An American school-boy knows the main features of the Giant's Causeway whose eastward thrust produces the basaltic columns of Fairhead, the chief promontory of the Irish coast, 550 feet high and directly ahead of the doomed vessel as it issued from the Chester estuary. Like Mona and the Dee the vicinity of the Causeway is replete with relics of the Druids. "The principal cairns are—one on Colin mountain near Lisburn and one on Slieve True near Carrickfergus; and two on Colinward. The cromlechs most worthy of notice are—one near Cairngrainey to the north-east of the old road from Belfast to Temple-Patrick; the large cromlech at Mount Druid, near Ballintoy, and one at the northern extremity of Island Magee. The mounts, forts and intrenchments are very numerous" etc., etc.—(*Encyc. Brit.* art. Antrim). The identification even without the name seems as perfect as that of Mona and the Dee.

The nymphs at play are not, as some teach, the Muses, but Nereids, maidens of the sea, whose presence is manifested in mists and clouds and is indicative of the weather as propitious or threatening. Had any of these appeared in their accustomed haunts—a heavy fog on the Dee or storm clouds in the direction of Fairhead or Mona—the mariners might have taken warning and postponed the voyage or at least felt their way cautiously instead of being lulled into carelessness by sly, "*sleek Panope*," the calm, fair weather that did in fact prevail.

If, as Dryden oracularly proclaimed, "Milton saw nature only through the spectacles of books," how, it may modestly be asked, did Dryden and his successors view it? I question whether he ever had first-hand knowledge, for instance, of the "Lydian measures" exploited in his *Alexander's Feast* or even had an adequate idea of what they were.

5. *L'Allegro*, line 136-. Having gone thus far at the end of the preceding note I will risk the further opinion that in the "Lydian airs" Milton complements his favorite Pindar, who frequently using Lydian metres, wrote an immense number of lyric poems—triumphal odes, hymns to the gods, convivial and dancing songs, celebrations of victory at the great games, including a description of the Islands of the Blest—all in harmony with the vivacious and joyous spirit of cheerfulness and a perfect antidote, one would

think, to "eating cares." He calls these "Lydian" rather than "Dorian" or "Æolian" airs, perhaps because of the varieties of Pindar's metres and the versatility of his genius resembling the winding flow of the Maeander, the chief river of Lydia.

Anyone who has seen the copy of Pindar in the Harvard Library with its copious notes in Milton's own hand will easily appreciate this expression of our English poet's delight in the old Greek lyricist.

JOHN A. HIMES.

Gettysburg, Pa.

A SOURCE FOR *GULLIVER'S TRAVELS*

It has long been a commonplace of literary criticism to say that *Gulliver's Travels* is like the *True History* of Lucian, though very little effort has been made to define the relationship between the two. Every edition of *Gulliver* mentions Lucian; two or three individual parallels have been pointed out by Hime in his monograph, *Lucian—The Syrian Satirist*, and by Pietro Toldo in an article entitled "Swift and Rabelais," in the *Revue des Etudes Rabelaisiennes*, for 1906; but the only full study of the sources of *Gulliver* (a German thesis by Borkowsky in *Anglia*, xv) makes no mention of Lucian whatsoever. Swift's debt to Lucian was recognized, however, by his own contemporaries. It is asserted in a conversation between Booth and the Unknown Author in Fielding's *Amelia*; and in dialogues of the dead by both Lyttelton and Voltaire, Swift is confronted by the resurrected Lucian, who proceeds to criticize *Gulliver*, comparing it to his own *True History*.

That Lucian's romance is the remote origin of the satiric *Voyages Imaginaires* cannot be questioned. In addition there are quite marked parallels to the work of Swift, several of which have not been noted before. There is a general similarity in the prefatory matter. Both *Gulliver* and *Lucian* despise falsified "Travels," and aim to be admired by posterity for their singular veracity. Both boast that they record plain facts without bias or prejudice. Both promise to omit technical descriptions and to avoid pedantic display of knowledge. Within the narrative, also, there are parallels in situation and satire. The travellers are hospitably received; they learn that the inhabitants are engaged in a desperate war;

and they enlist to help fight the enemy. Lucian's conversation with the departed spirits in Elysium, in so far as it includes Homer, Alexander the Great, and Hannibal, is reproduced by Swift in Gulliver's visit in the island of Glubdubdrib. Especially close is the common satire directed at the unfortunate commentators of Homer. The departed spirits unite in heaping disgrace upon "historians who write untruly." Yet in spite of these parallels the direct influence of Lucian is not very clear. In view of the great number of satirical romances written much nearer to Swift's time, several of which repeat these same Lucianic situations with various modifications, the burden of proof still rests upon those who assert that the *True History* furnished direct hints for *Gulliver's Travels*. After all, these parallels are not very significant. The case would be much more convincing, certainly, could we also trace to Lucian the central ideas which we meet in *Gulliver*: the satire of position and proportion embodied in the pygmies and the giants; the magical apparatus of Glubdubdrib and the superhuman statesmanship of the Houyhnhnms.

To arrive at any degree of certainty a connection between Swift and Lucian must be established. To assume that Swift had read Lucian is not a scientific procedure. So far as we know Swift had never read Shakespeare. Fortunately we can do a little better. In the *Journal to Stella*, Letter XIII, January 4, 1710-11, there occurs the following entry:

"I went to Bateman's the bookseller . . . and bought three little volumes of Lucian in French, for our Stella."

To make a long story short, among other translations of Lucian, there is one made by Perrot D'Ablancourt in the year 1648.¹ This translation includes the introductory essay "*Comment il faut écrire l'histoire*"; both parts of the *True History*; and in addition a third and fourth part written by D'Ablancourt himself by way of sequel, in which the traveller visits a land of pygmies; describes but does not visit a neighboring land of giants; is entertained in an island of magicians; and makes a long visit in an animal kingdom, where the animals are peaceful, prosperous, and wisely gov-

¹Nicholas Perrot D'Ablancourt (1606-1664) was a successful lawyer in Paris, and a recognized scholar in the classics. His work as a translator was praised highly by Boileau. He was admitted to the Academy in 1637.

erned, in contrast to the savage and degenerate human beings who live near by and who are subject to the animal rule.

There is then first of all this striking circumstance to connect Swift with Lucian: that to a French translation are added visits to "l'île des animaux . . . quelle étoit environée de celle des géans, des magiciens, et des pygmées"; but the contribution is much more than the mere general suggestion of places visited. The animal kingdom is not confined to horses it is true; in fact the horse is merely one of many species who live together. The parallel is rather in the contrast between the highly civilized animals, and the Yahoo type of human savages who are subject to the animals. The animal king (like the governor of the Houyhnhnms) is very indignant when he learns from the traveller of the gross injustice done to his domesticated cousins in the antipodes. Like Gulliver the traveller becomes convinced of the superior virtues of the animals.

The island of the magicians bears no detailed resemblance to the island of Glubdubdrib. The island of the giants (which adjoins that of the pygmies), is briefly described as a good place for travellers to avoid. The giants, who are over five hundred feet in height, fish for whales and throw mountains about for exercise. The race of pygmies, however, is most important. Unlike the little savages who attack Hercules in the classical legend, but like the Lilliputians, the pygmies of D'Ablancourt are governed by human laws, ruled by a benevolent king, skilled in waging war, and highly ingenious in the management of their domestic affairs. To be sure the race is idealized, not ridiculed, as it is by Swift; but it is a source for the fiction and not the satire that we are seeking in D'Ablancourt. There is also something of Swift's careful proportions in the extended and detailed account of the pygmy life. The minute rations consumed, the diminutive utensils used, are all in strict conformity with the scale of life. The traveller is entertained with a vaudeville performance ("marionnette") which lacks only the tight-rope walking exhibited at the court of Lilliput. In short, no other account of pygmy life gives anything like such a parallel to Swift. Yet D'Ablancourt has never been mentioned in connection with Swift; and, though his sequel is not at all inferior to the *True History*, it is hard to find any mention of it at all.

Two questions remain. Was D'Ablancourt's *Lucian* published in "three little volumes" before 1711, and if so did that edition include all four parts of the *True History*. The Catalogue of the British Museum has the following entry:

"Nouvelle edition . . . Corrige'e. 3 pt. Paris, 1674. 8vo. Grasse, "*Tresor des Livres Rares et Precieuses*," gives two others:

"Amst. 1688 3 tom. in 12."

"Amst. 1707 3 tom. in 12."

Of these editions, the last, printed in 1707, still would have been new volumes when Swift made his purchase in 1711; and hence this edition is, from every angle, most likely to have been the gift to Stella. This edition is in the New York Public Library; a full if not a complete translation of the works of Lucian,—and it includes all four parts of the *True History*.

When we read in the *Memoirs of Martinus Scribblerus* that the *Travels* were already outlined in Swift's mind as early as 1714, at least within three years of his purchase of the French *Lucian*, it seems very improbable that the resemblance should be a mere coincidence. Adding the parallels in D'Ablancourt's sequel to those contained in the *True History* itself, we are forced to the conclusion that we are in the presence, at last, of a very definite and a very considerable source for *Gulliver's Travels*.

Princeton University.

WILLIAM A. EDDY.

REVIEWS

French Literature of the Great War, by ALBERT SCHINZ, Professor of French Literature at Smith College. New York, Appleton, 1920. xiv + 433 pp.

The vast output of war literature in France is seen by us today in sufficient perspective to admit of a general survey. In France, the excellent bibliography of J. Vic, *La Littérature de la guerre* (Payot, 2 vols., 1918), is an invaluable guide, at least to the end of 1916, but it needs to be supplemented by synthetical works that classify and analyze tendencies and weigh historical, psychological, or aesthetic values. Mr. Schinz, in his desire to perform a like service for the American public, has given us a good, useful book.

His task was extremely arduous. He had to choose, sort, criticize. The field is immense, the quality of the material unequal, a standard for including or excluding a book difficult to determine: should it be literary merit, documentary value, moral or philosophical bearing? Doubtless in this choice personal preferences and reactions have a large share, but French readers, particularly the veterans of the war, are now almost unanimously for or against certain books. And I think that this public would accept with slight alteration the decisions of Mr. Schinz. All the works that I should like to find there, I find,—Lintier, Jean des Vignes Rouges, Le Goffic, Benjamin, Delvert, Gènevoix, Giraudoux, Duhamel, Dupont, Etévé, Rédier, Fribourg, the *Lettres d'un soldat*,—judiciously placed and in their true light. The criticisms are short, definite, fair: there are but few that I should question. Perhaps less indulgence might be shown toward certain names: the *Maurin des Maures* of J. Aicard (p. 31) would be astonished to see itself mentioned in the same line with Scapin or Gavroche; *Les Sauveurs du monde* of Vignaud seems less "remarkable" to me than to Mr. Schinz; *La Flamme victorieuse* of R. Gentry I find flat and ordinary; the declamatory lyricism of *Ceux de Verdun* by Péricard, often intolerable. These, however, are merely questions of personal taste. On the other hand, certain names are absent: if Barrès "during the first weeks of the war was a magnificent inspiration to the French people" (p. 11), should not Albert de Mun be mentioned also, whose articles, published in book form, *La Guerre de 1914* (1915), are fired with the same spirit? Together with the *Lettres d'un soldat*, I should name the admirable *Lettres de guerre* of Pierre-Maurice Masson. Lastly, certain authors are dealt with over-hastily: if Péricard is given six pages, *Les Derniers jours du Fort de Vaux* and *Les Captifs délivrés* of H. Bordeaux deserve more than two lines of foot-note; and I should have dwelt longer on the work of Capitaine Z***, *L'Armée de la guerre* and *L'Armée de 1917*, in my opinion, two of the most exact and powerful accounts that we possess of the conditions of the army in the field. But these slight objections do not detract from the value of the rich, well-chosen catalogue that Mr. Schinz offers us.

I admit that I have more serious reservations to make on the order and the plan adopted. Mr. Schinz divides the war production into three periods: "emotional reaction," "documentation,"

"philosophical considerations,"—and, in announcing this division, he immediately meets objections by recognizing that "no period produced one type of literature to the exclusion of all others." This objection, however, is not sufficient to deter him from this method of classification, which he finds clear and "corresponding in a general way to what happened." I believe that by this persistence Mr. Schinz has been of doubtful service to himself, and that he is under a slight illusion as to the agreement of this purely logical arrangement with the chronological succession of events. The reader feels that he is cramped by the framework he has built (see p. 230, for instance); he is obliged to take up in the "first period," supposedly finished "about the spring of 1915," works belonging to 1918 or even to April, 1919; to speak of books of 1915 in the "third period,"—and finally, to slice authors into two or three pieces whom he should have studied only in one place (e. g., Bertrand, pp. 42, 93, 101). Why not have followed the chronology of the war in its broad, clearly-marked periods: open warfare and the Marne, trench warfare, the renewal of open warfare, the victory? If it is true, as I think, that the three characteristics, of which Mr. Schinz makes three chronological moments, are actually to be found, they should be considered as three parallel currents, blending often with one another, whose proportion and importance vary at the different periods of the war,—or, if you will, as three increasing or decreasing series, whose respective size should be determined at the essential dates. The book, I believe, would thus give a more faithful image of literary life during the four years of struggle.

I come now to a few remarks on points of detail:

P. viii.—I do not agree that "literature in such circumstances is more than ever a luxury." Literature was a source of action and of inspiration. It was also a means of "information," a sort of connecting link between the combatants and the rear,—to which fact the first "war-books" owe their enormous success. It was, moreover, a noble and legitimate means of propaganda in foreign countries.

P. 18—I should omit the adverb "unintentionally" in speaking of the *Manifesto of the Ninety-Three German Intellectuals*.

P. 33.—Mr. Schinz criticizes rather severely *Le Feu* of Barbusse. I should be still more severe. No one can deny its literary merits.

But, at its date, the book was not only inexcusable, it gave an incorrect picture of the conditions at the front. Inexcusable, because it was a despairing book at the very time when the nation's energies needed galvanizing; an incorrect picture, because, however inhuman and infernal life in the trenches could be, it was not *always* inhuman and infernal. None of us could have stood it. There were quiet sectors, others that were intolerable. There were days when no rain fell, and when the sky was blue. There were also officers, and Barbusse ignores them,—another inexcusable action. Besides, to gauge the book, two facts are sufficient for me: the immense joy that hailed it in Germany; the alacrity with which it was published daily by American newspapers of pro-German leanings.

P. 71.—To the "prophecies concerning the war" add Jean d'Is, *A travers l'Allemagne*, 1913, whose opening pages disclose a seer.

P. 92.—"Joffre, Foch, and Castelnau are faithful Catholics." No; Joffre is a Protestant.

P. 102.—The *Lectures pour une ombre* of J. Giraudoux has been translated into English by E. S. Sargent in 1918, under the title *Campaigns and Intervals*.

P. 186.—I find Mr. Schinz's criticism of the French government's lack of foresight on the subject of submarine warfare unduly harsh. As much might be said of asphyxiating gas: in 1915, the problem was so gigantic that it could not be met at every point. The front had to be held at all costs; implements of war had to be improvised; heavy artillery, gas defense, had to be created; light machine guns manufactured; motor transportation, pursuit aviation, organized,—a thousand other things as well,—and this with the centre of industrial life invaded by the enemy, and all the men in the trenches. The government succeeded; and perhaps if at that moment it did no more for the navy, it was not through criminal neglect, but because of practical impossibility.

These objections to certain details¹ diminish neither the pleasure

¹ The book deserves, and will have a second edition. Therefore, I point out here some mistakes or typographical errors, which are regrettably numerous. Certain titles are incorrect: read p. 7, *Proses de guerre*, and not *Prose*; p. 12, *L'Amitié des tranchées*, and not *Amitiés des tranchées*; p. 61, *Quatorze histoires de soldats*, and not *Histoire de quatorze soldats*; p. 70, *Nolly, Gens de guerre au Maroc*, and not *du Maroc*, published in 1912, not in 1913; p. 70, *Psichari, Le Voyage du centurion*, and not *La Veillée du centurion*; p. 153, *Les Captifs délivrés*, and not *Les Prisonniers délivrés*;

nor the profit to be found in Mr. Schinz's book. He is indeed the first to attempt to disentangle a confused and complicated mass,

p. 160, *Le Bail, La Brigade de* (and not *des*) *Jean le Gouin* (p. 399, correct *Jean Gouin*); p. 202, Warnod, *Notes et croquis rapportés d'Allemagne*, and not *Notes et croquis de l'Allemagne*, published in 1915, and not in 1916; p. 205, *Le Martyre de Lens*, and not *Les Martyrs de Lens*; p. 317, Porché, *L'Arrêt sur la Marne* and not *de la Marne*; p. 364, Lichtenberger, *Juste Lobel alsacien*, and not *Alsacien* published in 1911, not in 1913; p. 379, Poulbot, *Des gosses et des bonhommes*, and not *Gosses et bonshommes*.—Certain names are misspelled: p. 35: *Eckenfelder*, not *Elkenfelder*; p. 70, *Détanger*, not *d'Etanger*; p. 102, *du Fresnois*, not *Dufresnois*; p. 124, *Jules Romains*, not *Romain*; p. 161, l'amiral *Ronarc'h*, not *Rornarch*; p. 164, *Roux-Parassac*, not *Parnasse*; p. 216, lieutenant *Niox*, not *Niod*; p. 225, *Maurice Talmeyr*, not *Talmayre*, 1918, not 1919; p. 245, *von Bernhardt* and not *Bernardi*; p. 295, *Champsaur*, not *Chamsaur*; p. 302, *Delarue-Mardrus*, not *Madrus*; p. 377, *Derenne*, not *Derene*; p. 411, *Ouy-Vernazobres*, not *Vernazobos*.—Certain mistakes of various sorts: p. 11, *Barrès* is not younger than *Maeterlinck*: they were born in the same year, 1862; p. 16, n. 2, *Hervé* published *Leur patrie* in 1910, not in 1915; p. 28, surely we should read *less exact*, and not *more exact*; p. 65, *Grandeur et servitude militaires* was published in 1835, not in 1836; p. 71, read *Sainte-Marie-aux-Mines*, not *des Mines*; p. 96, note 37, read *11^e Chasseurs*, not *II^e Chasseurs*; p. 114, *pupils*, not *pupis*; p. 115, *Croire*, by *Fribourg*, is slightly posterior to *La Flamme au poing*, by *Malherbe*; p. 125, a strange inadvertence: "*a château not far from the front, in Artois, near Rheims*"; another, p. 147: "*Le Mort-Homme (in the Vosges)*", instead of "*north of Verdun*"; p. 149, I do not understand the "*dying foot*" found in a boot long abandoned in a trench; p. 165, *sergent-fourrier* should be translated by *supply sergeant*, not *quartermaster*; p. 177, "*starting as an escort dragoon, he soon was made a 2nd class cavalryman*"; it is just the contrary: "*starting as a 2nd class cavalryman, he was given the duty of escort dragoon*"; p. 190, why give the title of *I. Rimbaud's* book half in French, half in English?; p. 193, *deputy mayor* signifies *acting mayor* and not *deputy and mayor*, which is the fact; p. 207, I should translate *La Fayette, we are here* by "*nous voici*," and not "*nous voilà*"; p. 237, *espionnage*, not *espionage*; p. 282, *Victor Cambon* is an "*ingénieur des arts et manufactures*," here he is confused with the two *Cambon* brothers, the diplomats; p. 312, read *Pithécantrope*; p. 314, *Paul Fort's* lines are cut in an unacceptable fashion; p. 321, correct *Infanterie*; p. 329, *Bertrandou*, not *Bertrandoux*; p. 348-394, why write *Reims*, and another time, *Rheims*?; p. 360, *Marseille*, not *Marseilles*; p. 361, *carrosse*, not *carosse*; p. 371, *premier prix du Conservatoire*, not *de Conservatoire*; p. 385, *Lamartine's Méditations* came out in 1820, not in 1819.

The *Index* leaves much to be desired. For instance, correct p. 415, *Adju-tant*, for *Adjudant*; p. 416, *Assomoir*, for *Assommoir*; p. 417, *Marseilles*;

and others, who perhaps will criticize his work, will begin by using it. Through analyzing and judging, he thinks and makes others think. To the literature of the war, to which he is our guide, he adds one more good book.

ANDRÉ MORIZE.

Harvard University.

La Galerie du Palais, comédie par Pierre Corneille, edited by T. B. Rudmose-Brown. Manchester, University Press; London, Longmans, Green, 1920. liii + 126 pp. (Modern Language Texts).

While American publishers are competing with one another in printing new editions of often edited texts, it is refreshing to find an English firm turning to a new field, that of Corneille's early comedies. Professor T. B. Rudmose-Brown of Trinity College, Dublin, has brought out a careful and tasteful edition of the *Galerie du Palais* which will, I hope, have enough success to encourage the editing of more of these pleasant plays. In his introduction he has used to advantage the work of Marsan, Toldo, Rigal, Lintilhac, and other scholars. He points out clearly how Corneille's comedies developed out of pastoral plays, in what their originality consists, and what are their relations to various literary phenomena of the period, especially *préciosité*, the unities, the use of a realistic background. The text is carefully reproduced according to the edition of 1682. Variants and stage directions are added from the edition of 1657, which was unknown to Marty-Laveaux. The notes are ample and sound. Indeed, both in introduction and notes Professor R.-B. strikes a happy mean between discursive editions and those that are too closely trimmed.

p. 418, *J. Champenois*, for *G. Champenois*; p. 420, the name Jean Denis is followed by no reference; p. 422, read *Fusiliers*, not *Fusilliers*; *R. de Gourmont*, and not *Gourmond*; p. 423, *Gus Bofa* should be under *Bofa*, not under *Gus*; p. 424, read *Kistemaekers*, not *Kistemacker*; p. 428, in the reference *Orage, G.*, it is hard to recognize *L'Orage sur le jardin de Candide*.

Finally, some errors in quotations from poetry; p. 306, Rostand's line is: "*comme une Marseillaise étrange des abeilles*," not *aux abeilles*; *encor*, not *encore*, to rhyme with *d'or*; p. 307, Verlaine wrote: "*Sans rien en lui qui pèse ou qui pose*." And why a blank space cutting each Alexandrine at the hemistich?

There are, however, certain statements that one can hardly accept without reservation. P. xxviii, in order to praise Corneille's comedies, it is unnecessary to belittle Molière's, which remain, when all is said, immeasurably superior. P. 1, if the author denies that Molière's comedies, other than the *Misanthrope*, are psychological, he should define his term; what, the student may well ask, are comedies of character? and did Molière write only one? P. xxxv, add to the list of plays showing shops on the stage the *Foire de Saint-Germain* (repr. 1634), mentioned in Mahelot's *Mémoire*. P. xi, no evidence is brought forward to justify the probably correct statement that the *Galerie* was first given at the Marais. P. 1, while there is an interesting characterization of Corneille's early comedies in general, little attempt is made to differentiate the *Galerie* from the others; it might have been well to point out that Corneille here shows dramatic progress by omitting such *trucs* as his earlier plays exhibit in the use of letters, madness, and an *enlèvement*. On the other hand, the play lacks characters of interest equal to that furnished by Amaranthe in the *Suivante*, Alidor in the *Palais*, or Clindor in the *Illusion*. P. xxxiii, Mr. R.-B. states that there is complete unity of action in the *Galerie*, though he admits that there are episodic scenes; also that there is "liaison des scènes" except for these episodic scenes, but he has overlooked the lack of *liaison* between scenes 9 and 10 of Act I.

It is a pity that the index fails to include all sixteenth and seventeenth century authors mentioned in the introduction as well as in the notes. I find no reference to M. Roy, whose discovery of Hardy's quarrel with his young rivals is referred to on p. xlviii. It would have been well to refer in the notes on ll. 195 and 408 to Martinon's article, cited only in the bibliography. As a source for line 861,

Beauté de qui les yeux, nouveaux rois de mon âme,

reference might have been made to the opening lines of Malherbe, *Poésies*, LXVIII:

Ils s'en vont, ces rois de ma vie,
Ces yeux, ces beaux yeux.

The following mistakes occur with regard to dates: P. 99, *Tyr et Sidon*, 1618 instead of printed 1608 and 1628; p. xviii, *le Déniaisé*, 1633 instead of pr. 1648; p. xxvii, Mahelot's *Mémoire*, 1633-36 instead of 1633-34. It is often not clear whether the date of print-

ing or of representation is meant. Du Ryer's *Amarillis* is dated 1650 on pp. xxiii and xxviii when the author seems to mean to indicate the date of first representation, which was about 1631-1633. Without any statement as to whether publication or representation is intended, *Sophonisbe* is dated 1634 on p. xxxiii and 1635 on p. 106; les *Visionnaires*, 1637 on p. xxxv and 1640 on p. xxvii. Marty-Laveaux's dates for Corneille's early plays are kept in spite of evidence to their lack of exactitude. One must not, however, conclude from these facts that Mr. R.-B. fails to realize the importance of dates, for to do so would be to overlook the pains he has taken to date the *Galerie du Palais* by citing lines 98-102, where, à propos of new books, the book-seller says:

Monsieur, en voici deux dont on fait grande estime;
Considérez ce trait, on le trouve divin.

Dorimant.

Il n'est que mal traduit du cavalier Marin
Sa veine, au demeurant, me semble assez hardie.

Le Libraire.

Ce fut son coup d'essai que cette comédie,

and by arguing from this that if the dramatist referred to in the last line is Corneille, the date when the book is sold must be 1633, for that is the date of publication of Corneille's *coup d'essai*, and that consequently that is the date when the *Galerie* was first represented. If, on the other hand, 1633 is the year when the *Galerie* was first represented, he argues that the play offered for sale must be *Mélite*, for Corneille is the only dramatist of any importance who published his first play in 1633. Then, without having proved either hypothesis, he concludes both that Corneille is referring to himself in the last line and that 1633 is the date of representation of the *Galerie*! I might as easily prove the *coup d'essai* to be by Scudéry and the date to be 1632 or the end of 1631, for his first play was published on Sept. 18 of the latter year. Indeed my argument would be the stronger, for Corneille is not likely to have accused himself of imitating Marino, while Scudéry was actually accused of such imitation by Mairet, as Marty-Laveaux has pointed out in his note on the passage quoted above.¹ But, as a matter of

¹ Mr. R.-B. thinks that the imitator of Marino is Saint-Amant, but the text indicates that the man so referred to is the author of the *coup d'essai* and consequently a dramatist.

fact, there is nothing to show that Corneille is there referring to any special play. He is merely giving examples of the kind of literary criticism then in vogue among gentlefolk. He is furnishing no evidence that can be relied on for the dating of the play. All we can do, until proof to the contrary is produced, is to date the play according to the probabilities of the case, which, as I showed seven years ago,² point more strongly to 1632 than to any other year.³

H. CARRINGTON LANCASTER.

Gottfried Kellers Leben mit Benutzung von Jakob Baechtolds Biographie dargestellt von Emil Ermatinger. Stuttgart und Berlin, 1916.

Gottfried Kellers Briefe und Tagebücher 1830-1861, herausgegeben von Emil Ermatinger. Stuttgart und Berlin, 1916.

Gottfried Kellers Briefe und Tagebücher 1861-1890, herausgegeben von Emil Ermatinger. Stuttgart und Berlin, 1919.

Paul Heyse und Gottfried Keller im Briefwechsel, von Max Kalbeck. Braunschweig, 1919.

The last word on Gottfried Keller, at least for the time being, is Emil Ermatinger's *Gottfried Kellers Leben, Briefe und Tagebücher*, in three volumes; or if not the last word, it is at least somewhere near the next to the last: the definitive scholarly edition of Keller's works has not yet appeared. This is promised for the near future.

Of the documents to which Ermatinger has access he still leaves some 200 letters unpublished:

Aber auch diese Sammlung der Briefe ist nur eine Auslese. Wohl zweihundert habe ich noch zurückbehalten. Aufgenommen habe ich alle mir zur Kenntnis gekommen Stücke, die irgendwelche Bereicherung unseres Wissens um Keller, den Menschen wie den

² *M. L. N.*, xxx, 4. Mr. R.-B. cites this article, but uses it little.

³ Typographical errors should be corrected as follows: p. xxv, l. 26, read *Sylvie*; p. xxvii, l. 16, Du Ryer, instead of Rotrou; p. xxviii, l. 14, aristocracy; p. 99, l. 36, *Mariane*; p. 106, l. 46, *maitresse*; p. 107, l. 15, *prétend*; p. 111, l. 17, &; p. 117, l. 42, *rigueurs*; pp. 3-19 (running title), premier.

Künstler, bedeuten. Weggelassen wurden nur—mit ganz wenigen Ausnahmen, bei denen mir eine Veröffentlichung noch nicht gestattet wurde—blosse Geschäftsbriefe oder kurze Billette, in denen sich auch ein so gottbegnadeter Stilkünstler wie Gottfried Keller auf dem Geleise der Convention bewegt. Ich hoffe, die Freunde des Dichters werden es mir danken, dass ich seine Briefkostbarkeiten nicht mit dem belanglosen Wuste des Alltags überschüttet habe. (Preface, vol. II.)

Not included in the Ermatinger material are all but one of Keller's letters to Paul Heyse; mention of this material will be made later.

It is possible that in the course of time additional Keller material of some interest and importance may be forthcoming. But in all probability Ermatinger's work will remain for a considerable time the chief repository of Keller biography.

Baechtold's work with its human sympathy for the subject is still a readable and useful book. It has never been, however, wholly satisfactory as a piece of finished, scholarly biography. With the mass of new material that has become available since it was written it has ceased to be the last word possible on the life of Keller. It is to add this last word that Ermatinger undertook a task that is less than an entirely new book on Keller such as Baldensperger's in its time, and considerably more than a new and amplified edition of the old Baechtold. Baldensperger contributed considerably to Keller scholarship in the way of critical appreciation, but so far as his biographical material is concerned, he leans wholly upon Baechtold, and in that respect he is now superseded along with Baechtold.

A new and amplified Baechtold with "möglichster Schonung des Baechtoldschen Textes" was by no means the comparatively simple task it might at first appear. Ermatinger in undertaking the work no doubt presently realized that an entirely new biography with Baechtold merely as one of the sources would actually have been less difficult and dangerous. Concerning the peculiar difficulty of the undertaking Ermatinger says in the preface:

Die ganze Wirkungskraft dieses Umarbeitungsplanes durchschaute ich, als ich an die Arbeit herantrat, noch nicht. Es war "möglichste Schonung des Baechtoldschen Textes" ausgemacht worden. Ich glaubte denn auch zuerst, meine Erweiterungen unter leichter Überfeilung des ursprünglichen Wortlautes und mit den nötigen Verzahnungen einfügen zu können. Allein bald offenbarte

sich der minenartige Charakter des Umbauplanes: er sprengte den alten Bau nach allen Richtungen und zwang zu durchgehender Neuarbeit. Wer dies bedauert und das alte Werk nicht missen mag, hat den Trost, Baechtolds Wortlaut in der einbändigen kleinen Ausgabe weiter zu benützen, die seine Witwe besorgt hat.

The finished product of this radical reconstruction might easily have been worse. It is very doubtful if the reader unfamiliar with Baechtold could detect the patchwork. For one with a familiarity with Baechtold's text there is the additional delight in the realization of the skill with which the amalgamation was accomplished. To use the best of Baechtold so naturally and with such apparent ease, to get away so completely from his occasional structural clumsiness where it seemed necessary to do so, and to weave the whole into a well-knit narrative was no small achievement. In reading text obviously entirely new, one suddenly but smoothly glides into the familiar phrases of Baechtold and then just as suddenly and smoothly out again into obviously Ermatinger text. To depart so far from the original in general structure and arrangement and yet to have it always on hand with "möglichster Schonung" etc. when the occasion seemed propitious, betrays a consummate familiarity with the Baechtold version and the material as a whole and a skill in recasting it eminently equal to the task.

The "möglichste Schonung des Baechtoldschen Textes" by no means signifies a lack of independence as to interpretation and point of view on the part of Ermatinger; nor is it entirely free from an unobtrusive touch of humor here and there. In speaking of the poet's more or less unpoetic sister Regula, Baechtold says: "Die Schwester blieb lebenslang ein bescheidenes Wesen, das man sich, bis auf die letzten Jahre, ganz gut aus der Umgebung des Bruders wegdenken kann." With "möglichster Schonung" even of the phraseology Ermatinger says: "Die Schwester Regula blieb lebenslang ein bescheidenes Wesen, das man sich aber doch nicht aus der Umgebung des Bruders wegdenken mag." Ermatinger does much to tone down Baechtold's somewhat too naturalistic portrait of the gifted poet's sister, upon whom the gods had smiled with no excess of kindness. As in other cases, Baechtold naturally had the advantage of more immediate observation, Ermatinger that of a truer time perspective. Thruout the whole work Ermatinger brings a cooler and more objective scholarship to bear upon his subject than Baechtold, and certainly as great a human sympathy and as broad a human understanding.

Where Baechtold betrays an occasional, but by no means objectionable, gossip flavor Ermatinger usually considerably weakens the dilution. Many picturesque idiosyncrasies of diction or expression in Baechtold are polished out in Ermatinger. Those who miss these things in Ermatinger may still enjoy them in the "Kleine Ausgabe" of Baechtold, essentially and in detail the same text as the complete Baechtold with the letters and diaries left out. Not even Ermatinger himself is so obsessed with the ambition entirely to supplant Baechtold as to omit mention of this in his preface.

Even for those who prefer the more picturesque and more brusque Baechtold, Ermatinger is a more than ordinarily readable book. The separation of the main text of the biography and the letters and diaries into separate volumes prepares the way for the continuity and the scholarly finish achieved by greater orderliness and relevancy in the arrangement of the narrative material itself in the case of Ermatinger as compared with his original. Occasional irrelevancies are omitted or given less space, but numerous interesting details that throw light upon the character and personality of the man rather than the artist or poet are by no means excluded by Ermatinger. In fact, much is added or amplified that does not appear in Baechtold at all or is passed over lightly. In Ermatinger there is, besides, better scholarly arrangement, greater emphasis upon those things that deal with Keller's development as an artist and as a poet. A better balance and greater technical skill make Ermatinger easier reading and assure a much more compact, a clearer and less attenuated, impression of the facts of Keller's life and personality. The fuller treatment of many details of Keller's life, the addition of some, by no means unimportant, episodes and the letters, about two hundred in number, hitherto unpublished, or published only recently in periodicals, make Ermatinger's work indispensable for the serious student of Keller's life and works.

Baechtold confines himself mainly to the more purely biographical; Ermatinger adds much valuable literary discussion in the way of critical comment and literary appreciation. In his critical comment and in drawing conclusions from the facts before him, Ermatinger is more conservative and objective, less positive and dogmatic than Baechtold. Thus, for example, Baechtold shows a decided tendency to belittle Feuerbach's influence upon Keller: "Diese Zeit des Unglaubens bildet indes nur einen Durchgangs-

punkt zu seiner (Kellers) späteren abgeklärten Religion, die in dem Goetheschen Satze gipfelt: 'das Unerforschliche ruhig verehren.' " (Baechtold, I, 333.) No doubt with this page of Baechtold before him Professor Walz ("The Life of Gottfried Keller," *The German Classics of the XIX and XX Centuries*, XIV, 7) draws the unqualified conclusion: "Later in life Keller returned to the religious views of his earlier years." It is exceedingly difficult to keep discussion such as this entirely free from subjective bias. This is Ermatinger's conclusion with regard to the Feuerbachian influence upon Keller: "In Feuerbachs Philosophie hat Keller eine Weltanschauung denkend erlebt, *seine* Weltanschauung, und darum wirkte sie auf ihn, trotz ihres atheistischen Charakters, als Religion, trotz ihrer materialistischen Tendenz als Idealismus, und eben deswegen übte sie auf ihn die gewaltige Wirkung, die eine bloss verstandmässige Annahme philosophischer Wahrheiten nicht haben kann. Sie hat sein dichterisches Schaffen auf Jahrzehnte hinaus aufs mächtigste befruchtet." (Ermatinger I, 204, 205.)

Much of the added material in the biographical part of Ermatinger's work is based upon letters given in full in volumes II and III. This helps to account for the greater bulk of Ermatinger's work, but it is a decided gain over Baechtold in a much more important respect. In Baechtold the letters appear in full as part of the body of the narrative; in Ermatinger, everything in the letters that has direct and positive bearing upon Keller's development as a poet and a man, but nothing more, is utilized in the main body of the biography and made an integral part of it. It is not necessary, as in Baechtold, to wade thru passages of ephemeral correspondence for the sake of the occasional passages of permanent significance. For the Keller scholar, volumes II and III give the complete text of the letters and diaries. Much material that in Baechtold appears in foot-notes and appendices is likewise worked by Ermatinger into the main body of the text.

It is not the purpose of the present review to hunt down all the errata in the Ermatinger text and appendices. One or two that incidentally came to my notice may, however, be pointed out. Volume III, p. 591 (Allgemeines Namenverzeichnis) under "Heyse," II 460 should be II 461. There is likewise no mention of Heyse on page 530 of volume III as here indicated.

In the preface to Volume II Ermatinger expresses regret as to

his inability to publish more than a single one of Keller's letters to Paul Heyse. This gap in the Keller material is supplied by Max Kalbeck's publication of the Heyse-Keller correspondence. As to its value as a contribution to Keller literature Kalbeck says in the slightly florid introduction: "Wohl wird von epochmachenden Ereignissen und grundlegenden Tatsachen nichts darin vermeldet, das nicht schon anderweitig bekannt geworden wäre. . . . Biographen, Ausdeuter und Erklärer scheinen, zumal was Keller betrifft, den Stoff so gut wie erschöpft zu haben." He pays high tribute to Ermatinger's work, but makes one important claim for his own work in connection with the publication of the Heyse-Keller letters: it will enable the reader of these letters to correct the somewhat misleading impression he may get out of Ermatinger as to the coolness and lack of real spiritual contact on the part of Keller toward Heyse. Kalbeck's accusation that Ermatinger lacks full appreciation of the warmth of Keller's feelings toward Heyse is admissible but not wholly convincing. Kalbeck seems to read an excess of coolness toward Heyse into Ermatinger's essentially cool and objective weighing of the material before him. Ermatinger, as a matter of fact, in forming his estimate of the personal and literary relationship between Keller and Heyse, seems to give fully as much weight to that which Keller wrote *about* Heyse to others as to that which he says directly to Heyse in his letters to him. Keller obviously assumes a somewhat patronizing attitude toward the younger man, but he had a very high opinion of his work, if not of his excessive literary industry, sought his advice in literary matters on occasion and, in one particular instance at least, acted on it; thus he rejected the title *Excelsior* for his last novel on the strength of Heyse's judgment that it was not sufficiently Kellersque.

Kalbeck supplements the text of the letters with copious and valuable biographical and historical notes. These in each case immediately follow the letter they are intended to elucidate, an arrangement that is much more convenient and useful for the reader than if they had been added in a separate appendix.

EDWARD FRANKLIN HAUCH.

Hamilton College.

Johnson Club Papers by Various Hands. London, T. Fisher Unwin, 1920. 238 pp. 8vo.

The first series of the *Johnson Club Papers* appeared in 1899. The present volume is the second series. In general, there is little difference between the two; each consists of a selection from the papers read at the quarterly meetings of the club, a fact which, at times, mars their excellence as literary essays. Moreover, one misses in the second a certain exuberant enthusiasm and humor which the first possessed. The papers are uniformly interesting; but, with one exception, they lack that basis of exact and exhaustive knowledge which ought to lie beneath every attempt at literary or psychological interpretation.

The exception is Henry B. Wheatley's paper, *Johnson's Monument and Parr's Epitaph on Johnson*. He brings forward some new material—correspondence and the like—which illuminates a post-mortem phase of Johnson's biography. Johnson had been dead twelve years before his statue was actually in place. 'Hawkins, Reynolds, and Boswell all died before the monument was finished, and Burke before sufficient contributions were obtained' (p. 227). One cause for much of the trouble was Dr. Samuel Parr. 'Parr was a man of great learning, with a singular lack of judgment. Having little or no sense of humour, he was continually making himself ridiculous. At the same time he was a formidable opponent, ever ready with a literary rapier as well as a bludgeon' (p. 228). In an evil hour he was asked to write the epitaph for the monument. From this point the account becomes excruciatingly funny. Of course the inscription must be in Latin—and in the proper Latin! Even Cicero was not good enough! Then poor Johnson must be deprived of his birthplace and of his title of Royal Academician because the Romans knew not Lichfield nor the Royal Academy. Finally, Parr reached the zenith of pedantry by hesitating to designate Bacon, the maker of the statue, by *sculptor* 'because he found in Coelius Rhodiginus that the art of statuary is divided into five sorts' with various names (p. 237).

Coming as it does at the end of the series, Mr. Wheatley's essay is positively refreshing after the often airy and speculative papers that precede it. The method of most of these is to take texts from Boswell and use them as starting points for excursions into various fields. The best of this sort are A. B. Walkley's *Johnson and the*

Theatre, interesting for its discussion of *Irene*, H. S. Scott's *Johnson's Character as Shown in his Writings*, which applies Johnson's statements about other writers to himself, and E. S. Roscoe's *Dr. Johnson and the Law*. Others of the same general sort are George Radford's *Johnson's Dictionary*, John O'Connor's *Dr. Johnson and Ireland*, Sir Charles Russell's *Dr. Johnson and the Catholic Church*, E. S. P. Haynes' *Dr. Johnson on Liberty*, and L. S. Hughes' *Dr. Johnson's Expletives*. Sir Chartres Biron's *Dr. Johnson and Dr. Dodd*, already a good essay, would be a good piece of scholarship, if Sir Chartres had taken advantage of the fact that the Dodd papers are now accessible.

Two others I single out: L. C. Thomas' *Sir Joshua Reynolds* and Edward Clodd's *Dr. Johnson and Lord Monboddo*. In the first, Reynolds is portrayed as an absolutely one-sided character, always kind and free-handed, with a temper quite unsoured by the world. This picture is false for two reasons: first, that no man could ever be so uniformly perfect as Mr. Thomas' Sir Joshua; and secondly, that a very short examination of, for instance, Sir Joshua's relations with his sister discloses a distinctly tart side to his nature. One of Mr. Thomas' own illustrations, Reynolds' mock dialogue with Johnson (p. 192), seems to show more than a trace of this side. The other paper, *Dr. Johnson and Lord Monboddo*, is stimulating by reason of the many questions it suggests, few of which are satisfactorily answered by the paper. Lord Monboddo, a noted Scotch jurist and philosopher contemporary with Johnson, a man sometimes credited with being a precursor of Darwin, in remarking the likeness between man and the great apes, unfortunately noticed the tail as an essential difference, and so pounced upon the idea not only that men had once had tails, but that there were probably tribes of men still possessing them. According to him, we lost our caudal appendages by dint of sitting upon them and wearing them away. Of course his contemporaries passed over the really sound ideas and leapt with one accord upon the tail. Here Mr. Clodd had a splendid opportunity—and let it pass. Was Monboddo really a great thinker laughed into oblivion by his own age because he lacked a sense of humor himself? or was he simply a slavish disciple of Plato and Aristotle, serving up their ideas with a few travellers' tales for seasoning? Was he a *pre-thinker*, or only a *pre-guesser*, if one may make such a distinction? Why did not

Johnson, a great classical scholar himself, take more kindly to a man who seems very like him in many ways? The only way to answer these questions satisfactorily would be to read Monboddo's works through carefully, judging them by their intrinsic merit alone; and this Mr. Clodd has not done. Perhaps nobody except William Knight¹ has gone through the twelve volumes of his two principal works for over a century. As to his connection with science, a paper by May M. Jarvis in the *Transactions of the Texas Academy of Science* for 1907 gives a modern scientist's opinion, based upon parts of Monboddo's *Antient Metaphysics*. Here is an opportunity to rediscover and map a lost mind (for Knight's treatment, though good, is not adequate); Mr. Clodd's paper only feebly scratches the surface.

It is difficult for a critic to censure a book which has given him pleasure. Many of these essays have real charm, though to a reader of Boswell they offer little that is new. They are pleasantly readable, written with the assurance of men used to speak with authority; but we have the right to expect something a little less superficial from a society bearing the name of Johnson. The multitude of chatty books nowadays crowds real authority off our library shelves; and this, when all is said, is only another chatty book about Johnson.

JAMES H. PITMAN.

Yale University.

CORRESPONDENCE

TOUTES CHOSSES

An interesting instance of the attraction of an adjective to an adjacent noun that it does not really modify is found in the common expression "toutes choses," where this expression is in apparent apposition to a preceding series of nouns.¹ A good example occurs in Renan, *Fragments philosophiques*, p. 322 (1876): "Le devoir, le dévouement, le sacrifice, toutes choses dont l'histoire est pleine, sont inexplicables sans Dieu." It is evident that the sense here is: "Le devoir, le dévouement, le sacrifice, [qui sont] tous

¹ Monboddo and his Contemporaries, London, 1901.

² Professor H. Carrington Lancaster points out that this construction is found with other nouns than *choses*, and furnishes the following case: "l'éducation qu'il a reçue, l'organisation politique, l'état social, toutes causes de son malheur," H. Gaillard, *Emile Augier et la comédie sociale*, p. 133. (1910). So far as my personal observation has extended, this construction, in contemporary French, is more common with *choses* than with any other noun.

[des] choses etc." *Toutes*—logically *tous*—is really a pronoun in apposition to the preceding nouns, but by the propinquity of *choses* masquerades as an adjective modifying the following noun. In English we should find: "Duty, devotion, sacrifice, all of them things, etc." A comparable case is "de guerre lasse" for "las de guerre."

Further instances are: "hasard, ni fortune, ni sort; Toutes choses très incertaines," La Fontaine, *Fables*, II, 13. "Prend une main, un bras, lève un coin du mouchoir; | Toutes sottises dont la belle | Se défend avec grand respect," *ibid.*, *id.*, IV, 4. (Quoted in Littré, *tout*, 11°). It is to be noted that here *toutes* is in apposition with a series of clauses, rather than nouns.) "Le mélange du grotesque et du tragique . . . l'émotion . . . le goût de la féerie . . . la trivialité du langage . . . le réel . . . l'idéal . . . toutes choses qui ne se présentent pas à l'esprit dans la patrie de Racine et de Voltaire," Doudan, *Mélanges et lettres*, I, p. 63 (c. 1828). "Elle s'est approvisionnée . . . de gants, de papier rose, . . . d'essences fines . . . toutes choses fort utiles sans doute, mais qui le sont moins qu'un dîner," Feuillet, *Roman d'un jeune homme pauvre*, (1858; p. 13 of Heath ed.). "La parole, le mouvement, la vie, toutes choses etc.," Halévy, *l'Abbé Constantin*, ch. 3. "Mais il n'était pas en moi d'avoir un cheval, un uniforme, un régiment et des ennemis, toutes choses essentielles à la gloire militaire," A. France, *Le livre de mon ami* (1885; p. 36 of Holt ed.). "de la terre et de ses fruits, de l'industrie, du négoce, des richesses amassées, . . . toutes choses qui, bonnes ou mauvaises, ne relèvent ni du prince ni des officiers de la couronne," *Id.*, *Les opinions de M. Jérôme Coignard*, p. 214 (1893).²

GEO. N. HENNING.

George Washington University.

A NOTE ON BIRÉ'S *Victor Hugo après 1830*

This letter, of interest to students of Hugo, is self-explanatory. I find the original, together with the envelope, pasted in volume I of Edmond Biré's *Victor Hugo après 1830* (Paris, Librairie Académique Didier, Perrin et Cie, Libraires-Éditeurs, 35, Quai des Grands-Augustins 35, 1891). The book, found in the library of the University of Texas, was owned formerly, no doubt, by M. Macé; a supposition which would seem to explain the presence of

²L. Clédat, in *Les Emplois de Tout* (*Rev. de phil. fran.*, XIII, p. 46), discusses a closely analogous construction, where, however, the noun is a predicative nominative after *être*. He states, furthermore, that in modern French the noun cannot be in the plural. The latest examples he gives are from *Tartuffe*, II. 4 and 151-152. (both quoted in Littré, *tout*, 12°).

the letter. The envelope (bearing a fifteen centimes stamp and the cancellation mark of Le Pouliguen) is addressed to "Monsieur Albert Macé, Homme de lettres, à Vannes (Morbihan)." The letter, the acknowledgment of an article by M. Macé in the *Journal de Rennes* (which the writer has not been able to see), is as follows:

Le Pouliguen, 28 août 1891.

Cher confrère et ami,

Au retour d'une petite excursion en Vendée, chez mon frère, je trouve le *Journal de Rennes* et votre excellent, votre charmant article. Je n'ai pas besoin de vous dire combien il m'a touché. L'assaut subi par mon pauvre livre a été si rude, que j'étais parfois tenté de croire que mes deux volumes ne valaient pas le temps et les soins qu'ils m'avaient coûtés. Votre article est venu me reconforter. Mon livre ne peut pas être mauvais puisqu'il obtient d'un si bon juge un tel témoignage. J'ai reçu du reste ces jours-ci, de divers côtés, des articles qui concordent pleinement avec le vôtre et tendent à me prouver que mon livre ne sera peut-être pas un trait impuissant, *telum imbelle, sine ictu*. . . . Je ne suis point un géant, qui brandit un cèdre, comme celui du *Moyse Sauvé*, ou un chêne, comme celui des *Odes et Ballades*; je n'ai point à ma disposition l'épée de Roland; j'ai trouvé seulement un assez joli lot d'épingles et j'en ai fait une bonne pelote. Si je ne m'abuse, ces épingles ont suffi pour dégonfler le ballon d'*Olympio*, pour percer à jour et mettre à mal cette fameuse légende, que Hugo était parvenu à épaissir autout de lui et à laquelle il travaillait, avec tant de zèle, depuis un demi-siècle et plus, si bien qu'il aurait pu dire au *Seigneur*, avec lequel il daignait converser parfois:

Mon Dieu, j'ai travaillé soixante ans pour MA Gloire!

J'espère pouvoir aller à Vannes avant la fin de l'année, et je serai bien heureux de vous renouveler de vive voix mes sincères et bien vifs remerciements.

A vous de tout coeur,

EDMOND BIRÉ.

ALBERT EDMUND TROMBLY.

University of Texas.

THE BIRTHDATE OF PUGET DE LA SERRE

Jean Puget de la Serre, "historiographe de France," is remembered in French literary history less for his few plays in prose than as a victim of Boileau and as one of the heroes of the famous parody *Chapelain décoiffé*. His numerous volumes on history, morals and philosophy—he is said to have produced about a hun-

dred works—are entirely forgotten, although a few of his devotional treatises are esteemed by bibliophiles for their engravings.¹ That they may not be entirely devoid of interest is exemplified by their “*dédicaces*” to various lofty personages, who protected Puget de la Serre, and by the incidental literary opinions which he expounds in them. His “*Tombeau des Délices du Monde*” (Reims, Moreau, 1631) contains, in the *Au Lecteur*, a eulogy of Jean Pierre Camus, Bishop of Belley, which has escaped the attention of the biographers of this pious and prolific novelist.² It also allows us to fix with precision Puget de la Serre’s birthdate, which is erroneously given as 1600 in biographical works. The two earliest in date, which speak at all about de la Serre, the *Grand Dictionnaire historique* of Moréri (vol. VIII) and Michaud’s *Biographie Universelle* (vol. 42) both state that he was born about 1600. Later compilers give his birthdate as exactly 1600. (*Biogr. Didot-Grande Enc.-Lalanne, Dict. Hist.*, etc.) Now Puget de la Serre states in the *Tombeau des Délices du Monde* (p. 14): *Il y a tantost trente sept ans que je suis au monde, et à peine puis je entendre le langage de la raison, je dy entendre, car de le parler, je begaye si fort, qu’ on diroit à m’ ouyr, que je ne fais que sortir du berceau.*” Since the *Privilege* of the book is dated July 16, 1630, Puget de la Serre must have written these words during the first six months of 1630. His birthdate can, therefore, be fixed in the year 1593.

GUSTAVE L. VAN ROOSBROECK.

University of Minnesota.

PATHELIN, LINE 344

Guillaume congratulates himself on having driven a sharp bargain with Pathelin and soliloquizes thus: “*Ils ne verront soleil ne lune, Les escus qui [qu’il] me baillera, De l’an, qui ne les m’emballera.*” He obviously means that he will know how to put them in a safe place. The last phrase “if somebody doesn’t steal them from me” is apparently meant to conjure away any evil omen. The first phrase, if written after 1475, doubtless contains a pun, for Louis XI caused “les escus d’or au soleil” to be coined in that year. But the phrase is certainly proverbial and may have been introduced in the play long before 1475. In the response of Charles

¹ *L’entretien des bons esprits sur les vanitez du monde* (1629)—*Les douces pensées de la mort* (1627)—*La vierge mourante sur le mont Calvaire* (1628)—*Le Miroir qui ne flatte point* (1632)—*Les Merveilles de l’amour divin* (1632) and other works of the same nature. Cf. Brunet, *Man.*, III and *Suppl.* I.

² F. Boulas, *Un ami de St. François de Sales: Camus*, 1878; A. Bayer, *J. P. Camus und seine Romane*, 1906.

d'Ivry to the *Cent Ballades* (end of fourteenth century) we read: "Prince loial, se nul, soit jeune ou vieulx, Sert Fausseté, on le met en telz lieux Qu'il ne voie jamaiz solleil ne lune." (*Les Cent Ballades*, ed. by Gaston Raynaud, p. 218.) The ballads are full of proverbial expressions.

BENJ. M. WOODBRIDGE.

University of Texas.

NOTES ON THE AUTHORSHIP OF *The North Briton*

In my article "The Political Satires of Charles Churchill" (*Studies in Philology*, xvi, 4, October, 1919, pp. 303-333) I discussed briefly the work of John Wilkes and Charles Churchill in *The North Briton*. Since the publication of that article I have found in *The John Wilkes Correspondence with Charles Churchill, 1762-1764*, in the British Museum, Addit. mss. 30, 878, the following further information.

On Tuesday, July 27, 1762, Wilkes writes to Churchill from Winchester, "I admired exceedingly what I read last Saturday. Are you determined to have the palm of prose, as well as of poetry? . . . I have sent a strong *North Britain* for next Saturday, and have order'd Kearsley to bring you the proof. . . Will you undertake for Saturday sevensnight?"

On September 9, Wilkes writes to Churchill from Great George Street, telling him his plans for the attack upon Hogarth. "I shall attack him in hobbling-prose," he says, "you will I hope in smooth-pac'd verse."

On October 18, Wilkes asks Churchill if he approved last Saturday's *North Briton*, and adds, "Pray take care of next Saturday tho' I shall send a letter about the infamous story of the boy, which should be inserted: but I leave the whole to you." This refers to an attack made upon Wilkes in *The Auditor*, Number xvii, in which was quoted a libelous conversation between the demagogue and the young son of the Earl of Bute.

On November 2, Wilkes notes that *The North Briton* has "deviated into the primrose paths of down-right poetry" and says he will allow Churchill to continue in those paths till "Saturday sevensnight, when I shall bring him back to the dull hobbling road of insipid prose."

Those passages indicate more definitely than those hitherto quoted the part played by Wilkes and by his collaborator in producing the greatest mouthpiece of the Opposition in 1762 and 1763.

JOSEPH M. BEATTY, JR.

Goucher College.

BRIEF MENTION

"The Background of the 'Battle of the Books,'" by Richard F. Jones (Reprinted from *Washington University Studies*, Vol. VII, Humanistic Series, No. 2, pp. 97-162, 1920). The title designates Swift's satire (1697-1698), and Dr. Jones aims to show that it was the outgrowth, a final expression of a century-long controversy in England (with only incidental reflections of French thought),—a controversy too that was "philosophic and scientific rather than literary and artistic in nature." The simple terms battle, war, quarrel, etc. are available for this comprehensive controversy, which is presented as having passed thru successive stages "where a definite protagonist on either side appears." Three stages are distinguished: (1) the "Controversy over the Decay of Nature with Goodman and Hakewill as opposing heroes"; (2) the "Controversy over the Royal Society with Stubbe opposed to Sprat and Glanville"; and (3) the "Controversy over Ancient and Modern Learning wherein Temple and Boyle face Wotton and Bentley."

Bacon was "largely responsible for creating the war, giving it 'the philosophic cast.'" Had he given it also the literary cast, "the nature of the quarrel in England would have been quite different." As it was, the first definite contest was waged over the paradox (announced by Bacon) that "we are the ancients, the ancients the moderns" (see *MLN.* xxxvi, 257, and Guthkelch, p. 259). This imposed old age and decrepitude on mankind and indeed on all nature. This argument was sustained by Goodman, bishop of Gloucester, in *The Fall of Man or the Corruption of Nature proved by Natural Reason*, 1616. The error was rebuked in *An Apologie, . . . consisting in an Examination and Censure of the Common Errour touching Nature's Perpetual and Universal Decay*, 1627 (reaching a third edition in 1635), by George Hakewill, Arch Deacon of Surrey. Hakewill represents the high point of the controversy in its comprehensive form. "In no other country or time did the conflict embrace so wide a field." In a book of four parts the stability of the powers of nature and of the mind of man—imagination, judgment, and memory—are seriously and elaborately defended against the argument of gradual deterioration. In the comparison of the ages with respect to "Arts and Wits," the three modern inventions of "Printing, Gunnes, and the Mariner's Compasse" are handled in that specific manner which was effectively adopted by subsequent advocates. Influenced by Bacon the earnest Arch Deacon's defence is almost exclusively philosophic and scientific. With a mind not literary he, however, for "completeness of design" has a discussion of Greek and Latin poetry, "brief and faint-hearted," and something in the way of a comparative estimate of English poets. In itself unimportant enough, this feature has significance in the history of the conflict. Dr. Jones concludes this chapter with a brief notice of Henry Rey-

nold's *Mythomystes*, "a unique and isolated skirmish in the quarrel." It is a lamentation over a senile world and the inferiority of the modern poets, supported by less usual details.

The conflict of the Baconian system with the old syllogistic philosophy assumed definite outlines that stimulated the founding of the Royal Society. This aspect of the subject is reviewed in the second chapter. Sprat, in his *History*, which Dr. Jones reports with fine discernment, supplies the principal events, and as "the Huxley of the age" (p. 119) argues the claims of the new method with a zeal for correcting traditional notions and with a comprehensive view of educational elements whether old or new. "The method is Sprat's slogan," not the accomplishment as with Hake-will. "Like Bacon he stakes his all on the results that will be obtained. . . . The controversy is one between tradition and progress," in matters philosophic and scientific. There is some incidental indication of Sprat's judgment of what the moderns must overcome to equal the ancients in literature, and his passage on the desired effect of scientific accuracy and clearness on literary style is, of course, especially noteworthy. He also anticipates Wordsworth in declaring that the advance of science will enrich the poet's storehouse of symbols and figures of expression, thru "an understanding of new virtues and qualities of things." In the sketch of the controversy between the defenders and the opponents of the Royal Society many a detail fits the present day. For example, Stubbe "upholds the cultural education based on the classics against the material and mechanical education derived from experiment." There is, moreover, the development of a side-play by that class of philosophically superficial minds to which the minuteness of scientific experiments becomes merely a chartered theme for cheap ridicule. As representing this class are mentioned Shadwell, Butler, D'Urfey, and Mrs. Manly (p. 130).

"The Critical Dilemma" (the title of the third chapter) describes the peculiar attitude of English critics when comparing modern with ancient literature. It was a shifting attitude, just suited to Dryden the chief of the critics. Dr. Jones offers a plausible formula of the unsettled state of critical judgments, "of the chaotic condition of seventeenth-century criticism." He believes "that the critics embraced a critical creed that did not justify their taste" (p. 136). The critical creed of French neo-classicism was accepted and verified intellectually, but clashed with emotional and artistic convictions as to native literature. "In this state of affairs, it was hardly possible for a controversy over the respective merits of the ancients and moderns to arise. Their allegiance to the rules prevented critics from asserting the superiority of their own poets, though their instinctive liking for their own literature might be great." Besides, the English language as an adequate medium of great art was held in doubtful estimation. But the

nationalistic feeling gained in assertiveness thru an estimation of French classicism. "English substance" won "against French thinness." Dennis finds "greater geniuses in England than in France," and these are not fettered by codifications of critical principles. Liberal in acknowledging the excellence of the traditional forms, they are also free in experimentation, sustained by the response of the national consciousness.

Out of the tolerance, wavering, and national indifference to a specific quarrel there issues in the last decade of the century (the seventeenth) a definite advocacy of the moderns against the ancients in literature. The defender is Charles Gildon "a true son of Dryden, from whom he derived most of the arguments he advanced against the strict application of Aristotle's rules to the English drama," and a "strong nationalistic tone." He "speaks of a 'present controversy,' but he had read neither Fontenelle nor Perrault." He was inspired by Dryden's arguments of 1668, and attacked Rymer's *Tragedies of the Last Age* of 1678, which preceded Perrault's poem by nine years. "Corneille and Rapin had 'influenced Dryden and Rymer, and to that extent the controversy was imported from France.'" But Gildon's "inspiration came from English sources" and his activity would probably have been the same, "if Perrault had never written." Tho "he later completely reversed his position," Gildon is thus found to be "the only English critic of the seventeenth century that came out unreservedly for the moderns."

A statement like the following gives an indication of the coherent history of the philosophic and scientific controversy: "In Glanville the two streams flowing from Bacon and Hakewill unite, and from him the enlarged current flows to Wotton and the end of the quarrel" (p. 126). Starting with Swift's *Battle*, which marks that end, one may move up the stream by taking in inverse order the argument of Dr. Jones's last chapter. The thread of the controversy taken in that order is this, that the *Battle* was designed to support Temple's *Essay*, which in its turn was elicited by Burnet's *Sacred Theorie of the Earth* wherein the controversy over the Royal Society was renewed. This reduces Temple's reaction to Fontenelle's *Digression* to an incidental or merely contributory 'provocation.' By this elevation of Burnet above Fontenelle, Dr. Jones keeps his argument at a crucial point running true to the assumption that the quarrel was not imported from France. Temple turns away from Fontenelle and "refuses to discuss the poetical aspect of the controversy on the ground that poetry should be a subject in itself." His very title betrays his concern with 'learning,' and his treatment of 'knowledge' and 'progress in the search and discoveries of the vast region of truth and nature' is in the English manner, the manner of Hakewill, Sprat, and Burnet. "It was the revival of the attack on the new science, and had little to do with the quarrel in France, which was largely literary."

The controversy in its latest form was, of course, not unrelated to the quarrel conducted in France, that is not denied; but Dr. Jones contends that the foreign influence as it shows itself in Swift was a natural consequence of the native controversy having become less specifically philosophic and scientific and more literary thru the contentions of Wotton and Bentley. But to the end, as when "the Goddess of Criticism sheds her blessing on Gresham College," the method and the details of the English argument are traceable back to Hakewill. Altho Temple and Swift were by education and temperament unfitted to admit the claims of the new philosophy, they were too closely knit up with the English side of the controversy to depart from its traditional method and to adopt the specifically French method. Swift while at Oxford not only showed his lack of mathematical ability, but also acquired the institutional hatred of the scientific learning; and in this localized influence the spirit of his contention reaches back to Joseph Glanville who, in 1661, had conducted "a vigorous campaign against the scholastic philosophy dominant at Oxford" (p. 117).

Mr. Jones has made a valuable contribution to the wider and deeper view of the quarrel, which Macaulay misunderstood so completely as to characterize it "as childish, idle, and contemptible."

J. W. B.

Schwäbisches Wörterbuch, auf Grund der von A. v. Keller begonnenen Sammlungen und mit Unterstützung des Württembergischen Staates bearbeitet von HERMANN FISCHER. Fünfter Band. Tübingen, H. Laupp'sche Buchhandlung, 1920. iv pp., 1976 cols., 4to. The beginnings of the *Schwäbisches Wörterbuch* date back to the middle of the last century, when A. v. Keller began to register the grammatical and lexicographical peculiarities of his dialect, enlisting, at the same time, the aid and co-operation of other competent observers. After Keller's death in 1883 Hermann Fischer, son of the poet Johann Georg Fischer, took up the task. Preliminary to the *Wörterbuch*, his *Geographie der schwäbischen Mundart* was published in 1895. Six years later the first fascicle of the *Wörterbuch* left the press, and the appearance of the sixty-first instalment, in June, 1920, marked the completion of five stately quarto volumes. Soon afterwards a protracted illness befell Fischer, resulting in his death on October 30, just after he had entered upon his seventieth year. He was thus not to see the conclusion of his labors. In fact, in the preface to the first volume (1904) he had asked the question: "wer weiss, ob am Schluss ich noch selber das Wort haben werde?" The sixth and final volume is being edited by Wilhelm Pfeleiderer, Fischer's principal assistant for a number of years.

It is impossible here to enter upon a detailed description of the

work. I may point out, however, that it is by no means limited to the spoken, or written, dialect in the usual sense of the word, altho, to be sure, the living language of the present is taken as the point of departure. Wieland, Schubart, Schiller, Uhland, Mörike, Hermann Kurz, and other authors of lesser note are cited wherever their writings furnish illustrations of specifically Suabian idioms. Furthermore, in addition to the literary monuments concerned, historical documents of every description were consulted, yielding dated evidence that is most valuable as a supplement to Grimm's *Deutsches Wörterbuch*. Take for example, the word *Aschermittwoch*: Grimm cites no early instances, Kluge assigns it to the sixteenth century, while Fischer furnishes a series of dated instances beginning with the fifteenth, whilst forms such as *die äscherig Mitwoch* are traced back to the middle of the fourteenth century. Similar instances could be multiplied. The book is indispensable to every serious student of the history of the German language.

In conclusion, it may not be out of place to refer to the other great activity of Fischer's later life, namely his presidency of the *Litterarischer Verein* of Stuttgart, in which, also, he was Keller's successor. More than one hundred rare and important volumes were reprinted under Fischer's supervision, including Hans Sachs, Georg Wickram, the pre-Lutheran Bible, and Hugo von Trimberg. At the close of the war the invested funds of the society had shrunk to such an extent that further publication was practically impossible, and it was regretfully decided to liquidate its affairs. Volume 266, issued in July, 1915, thus forms the end of a long and important series.

W. K.

Dufresny, Charles. *Amusemens sérieux et comiques*. Introduction et notes de Jean Vic. Paris, Editions Bossard, 1921. 215 pp. 12 francs. [Collection des chefs-d'œuvre méconnus.] This careful reprint, on good paper, with a scholarly introduction should be welcome to students of the French novel. It groups conveniently the still too scanty facts known about Charles Dufresny (1648-1724) amiable trifler, and *amuseur* of Louis XIV, but a friend of Regnard, whose *Le Joueur* Dufresny is said to have suggested, editor for a while of *Le Mercure Galant* and author of a number of comedies which are not all forgotten. The editor, who has previously published the results of his study of Dufresny in the *Revue du dix-huitième siècle* (1916-1917) has also brought to light a forgotten playlet of Dufresny's, *Les Dominos*, which was produced at the Odéon in 1917 and published the same year by Hachette. However, Dufresny's chief title to attention is his *chef-d'œuvre méconnu*, the *Amusemens sérieux et comiques*, first published in 1699 and immediately successful. M. Vic prints the hitherto unknown final text of 1707, adding the variants from the first edition.

Dufresny names La Rochefoucauld and Pascal as his masters, Beaumarchais borrowed some traits for his Figaro and his Fanchette from his plays. As to the influence of the *Amusemens* on Montesquieu's *Lettres Persanes*, pointed out already by Voltaire, M. Vic shows that this may well be explained by the common use of Giovanni Marana's *l'Espion du Grand Seigneur*. A curious point is that Balzac apparently borrowed an episode from the *Amusemens* for *La Paix du ménage* (1830). J. E. G.

Comedias de Lope de Vega, t. I, ed. y notas de J. Gómez Ocerín y R. M. Tenreiro (Madrid, *La Lectura*, 1920. 225 págs.). Mucha falta estaba haciendo una edición esmerada y al mismo tiempo manejable de las obras dramáticas del Fénix, que por inexplicables razones no había sido hasta ahora incluido en la colección de "Clásicos castellanos."

El remedio en la desdicha y *El mejor alcalde, el Rey* son las comedias elegidas por los Sres. Ocerín y Tenreiro para este primer tomo. Ahí van algunas observaciones acerca de las notas intercaladas en el texto.

En la correspondiente al verso 328 de *El remedio en la desdicha* han debido citarse otras obras en que el autor explota el mismo tema de la caída de los Abencerrajes. Sobra la 1057: no había necesidad de recurrir al *Dicc. de Autoridades* porque la frase es corriente. El verso 1936 es indudablemente muy malo, pero consta si hacemos una sinalefa forzada. Lo mismo sucede en el 2750 (*¿Qué te ha enviado? Aquel papel.*), donde *aquel* ha sido sustituido por *el* innecesariamente, ya que el verso puede leerse como octosílabo, haciendo diptongo en *enviado*. De no admitir tal diptongo tampoco constaría el verso 85. El giro empleado en el 1396, aunque no empaña la claridad del concepto, no es común hoy; pide nota. Tampoco vendría mal una breve explicación al 1447.

En las octavas con que comienza el acto tercero de *El remedio en la desdicha*, tal vez por haberlas escrito en esdrújulo, usa Lope varios vocablos que a mi juicio deben llevar nota a causa de su raro empleo (*mágica*, *belífero* y otros). *Africa* no consueña con *trágica* y *mágica*, ni *estériles* con *débiles* y *flébiles*. Puesto que en otros lugares se anotan los defectos de rima, también deben anotarse aquí.

Ultima observación. Teniendo en cuenta que los volúmenes de *La Lectura* van dirigidos a todos los interesados en el estudio de nuestra literatura clásica, sean o no eruditos, creo que faltan algunas noticias aclaratorias acerca de ciertos personajes mitológicos que no pueden ser familiares sino a los muy versados en la materia.

Tan leves como éstos son los reparos que pueden ponerse a las acertadas notas de *El mejor alcalde, el Rey*. J. R.